DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 174 146 HE 011 552

TITLE	State Policy and Postsecondary Education: The Relationship of the Independent and Public Sectors.
INSTITUTION	Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo.; Florida State Dept. of Education, Tallahassee.; Florida State Postsecondary Education Commission.
SPONS AGENCY	Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo.
PUB DATE	78
NOTE	120p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Planning; Conferences; Educational Demand; Educational Economics; Educational Supply; Financial Support; Higher Education; Needs Assessment; *Private Colleges; *Public Policy; Resource Allocations; *State Aid; State Programs; State Schools; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS	*Florida

ABSTRACT

The relationship between the public and independent sector of higher education in Florida is examined in this conference publication. The problems and issues involved in formulating state policy with respect to postsecondary education in Florida are examined. An overview of policy positions of other states is presented as well as an assessment of the present and prospective status of postsecondary education in Florida, a discussion of the possible components to be included in a policy statement, and an assessment of the legal and fiscal realities implicit in the adoption of a policy statement. Section I of the report provides a conference overview and two papers: "The Issues" (Senator David L. Boren) and "State Policies and Programmatic Implementation" (Richard W. Jonsen). Section II contains presentations on the policies of selected states towards independent higher education including: "Pennsylvania" (Edward McGuire), "Illinois" (Joseph D. Boyd), and "California" (Morgan Odell). A discussion of the policy issues facing the federal government in this area is presented in Section III by John D. Phillips in a paper entitled "Policy Issues, The Federal Government, and Diversity." Section IV of the report is a summary of the total meeting and includes the conference program, the membership of the Florida Postsecondary Education Commission, and a list of the conference participants. (SF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED174146

STATE POLICY AND POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION: THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE INDEPENDENT AND PUBLIC SECTORS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Fla. Dept of Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Report of a Statewide Conference
Orlando, Florida, November 30 - December 1, 1978

Sponsored by

The Florida Postsecondary Education Commission
The Education Commission of the States: Inservice Education Program

HE 011 552

State of Florida
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida
Ralph D. Turlington, Commissioner
an equal opportunity employer

This public document was promulgated at an annual cost of $2,765.65 or $4.61 per copy to provide information about state policy and postsecondary education to the state's postsecondary education institutions and leaders, elected officials and interested citizens.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents. iii

Preface. v

Conference Photographs. ix

Section I

Conference Overview. 1

The Issues
by Senator David L. Boren of Oklahoma. 11

State Policies and Programmatic Implemention
by Richard W. Jonsen. 31

Section II

Programs in Selected States. 49

Pennsylvania
by Edward McGuire. 51

Illinois
by Joseph D. Boyd. 57

California
by Morgan Odell. 65

Section III

Policy Issues, The Federal Government, and Diversity
by John D. Phillips. 73

Section IV

Summary Notes
by Louis Rabineau. 89

Appendix A -- The Conference Program. 103

Appendix B -- Membership: Postsecondary Education
Commission. 109

Appendix C -- The Conference Participants. 113

PREFACE

The Postsecondary Education Commission (PEC) was approved by the State Board of Education on April 17, 1973, and charged with functioning in an advisory capacity to the Commissioner of Education and the State Board of Education on matters relating to postsecondary education in Florida. In March of 1978, the Commission noted the lack of an articulated public policy with respect to independent postsecondary education in Florida. Recognizing the need for such a policy statement, the Commission recommended to the Commissioner and the State Board of Education that one of the Commission's comprehensive planning activities for the 1978-79 fiscal year be an analysis of the public/private postsecondary education sector relationship in Florida. This analysis was to include Commission meetings, a statewide conference in cooperation with the Education Commission of the States, and conference follow-up by the Commission members resulting in recommendations to the Commissioner of Education.

The Education Commission of the States Inservice Education Program was invited to co-sponsor a statewide conference with P.E.C. on "State Policy and Postsecondary Education: The Relationship of the Independent and Public Sectors." The co-sponsors agreed that the purpose of the conference was to provide a background relating to the problems and issues involved in formulating state policy with respect to postsecondary education. The conference would (1) review actions taken

elsewhere in the nation; (2) assess the present and prospective status of the postsecondary education sector in Florida; (3) consider possible components to be included in any statement of policy; and (4) assess the legal and fiscal realities implicit in the adoption of such a statement. The Postsecondary Education Commission sought this information in furtherance of its obligations to consider formulating recommendations to the Commissioner of Education concerning the relationships between the several groups which function in both the public and independent sectors of postsecondary education in Florida. The Conference program which resulted from these goals can be found in Appendix A, and a list of the current P.E.C. members may be found in Appendix B.

The sponsors were gratified by the attendance during the November 30 - December 1, 1978 Conference convened in Orlando, Florida. One hundred and seventy three policy makers from the various sectors of postsecondary education in Florida, as well as from both the legislative and executive branches of state government, were on hand for the meeting. A complete conference roster may be found in Appendix C. In preparation for the Conference, the P.E.C. also prepared the following two documents, which are available upon request from the Department of Education:

1) A Directory of Independent and Public Postsecondary Institutions in Florida, October, 1978; and

2) Existing Relationships Between Independent Postsecondary Institutions and State Educational Agencies in the State of Florida, October, 1978.

The format of this report essentially follows the sequence of presentations at the conference. Section I provides a conference overview and papers on the basic issues and policy areas covered during the meeting. Section II contains presentations on the state policies of selected states towards independent postsecondary education. Section III provides a discussion of the policy issues facing the federal government in this area, and Section IV is a summary of the total meeting.

As a result of the conference, the Commission met in Tampa, Florida on February 8-9, 1979, and adopted a series of recommendations on public/independent postsecondary education in Florida for submission to the Commissioner of Education. The final Commission report will be distributed along with these conference proceedings and additional copies are available from the Department of Education.

The members of the P.E.C. wish to extend their appreciation to the staff of the Education Commission of the States for their many contributions during the conference. In addition, thanks are extended to all of the individuals listed in the program (Appendix A) for their direct assistance both in the planning and the execution of the conference. The members are particularly grateful to Senate President Phil Lewis and House Speaker Hyatt Brown for their taking the time to join us in Orlando, and for their thoughtful presentations on this topic. Their attendance at the meeting, and obvious interest in this topic, contributed greatly to the success of the conference. Furthermore, I would like to acknowledge the assistance

of the Florida Association of Private Schools who sponsored the reception and assisted the co-sponsors in the registration process. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the excellent work of my staff during the planning and implementation of the conference, and for their many efforts in the preparation of these proceedings.

Charles B. Reed, Executive Director
Florida Postsecondary Education Commission

CONFERENCE PHOTOGRAPHS

SECTION I

CONFERENCE OVERVIEW

Since 1960 many states have expressed interest in the development or examination of education policies related to the independent sector of postsecondary education. In fact all states but one, according to one speaker, Richard Jonsen, Senior Staff Associate with the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, support nonpublic institutions or students which attend them.

David W. Breneman and Chester Finn stated in their publication, Public Policy and Private Education, that there were four "cognitive" reasons for this interest. First, the prospect for growth in higher education as experienced in the fifties and sixties had become quite bleak. This in turn contributed to a widespread belief that the industry could be expected to head toward a retrenchment period. The authors further argued that if the deterioration was concentrated in the private sector, then the public interest would be "poorly served," and thus, there is a need to develop public policies to insure that a fair competitive situation would exist in the higher education industry. (The fate of specific institutions would depend on their performance not on their funding source.)

Second, the authors stated that the interest to develop an education policy related to the independent sector was enhanced since "the impersonal working of the existing higher education

market place can not be relied upon to direct resources in a socially optimal manner." They blamed the intricate and quilt-like manner in which higher education was funded for this situation. (For example tuition prices do not reflect resource costs accurately.)

Third, according to Breneman and Finn, given the large cost investment in physical plants and personnel it would be foolish for states to consider expansion to public campuses without contemplation as to the cost-effective options of "partially subsidizing additional enrollment in independent institutions."

Finally, the authors believed that the fact over forty states have developed some form of policy of financial support for the independent sector would have to be considered as strong indication of public willingness to provide aid to these institutions.

The Florida Postsecondary Education Commission, sensitive to arguments such as those mentioned above, on November 30 - December 1, 1978 convened a conference of state educational representatives, legislators, and officials from Florida's public and independent postsecondary institutions. The Commission's goals were to : 1) review actions taken elsewhere in the nation; 2) assess the present and prospective status of the postsecondary education sector in Florida; 3) consider possible components to be included in any statement of policy; and 4) assess the fiscal and legal realities implicit in the adoption of such a statement.

At this conference higher education officials from states such as Pennsylvania, Illinois, and California told members about policies and programs found in the states they represented.

Government and higher education officials in Pennsylvania, according to Edward McGuire, Chancellor, Massachusetts Board of Higher Education (former Pennsylvania Commissioner of Higher Education) believed it was in the best interest of the public as well as the students if Pennsylvania funded the independent sector since they believed the real strength in higher education could be found in the institutions' ability to offer students different approaches to higher education. With this belief in mind Mr. McGuire said Pennsylvania provided support to their independent institutions in four ways: direct grants to students; institutional grants to help independent colleges and universities pay direct costs required to educate students; loans to students; and finally, direct aid to support four private medical schools.

Joseph Boyd from the Illinois State Scholarship Commission told conferees that officials who desired to develop, and with success implement, a state policy to aid independent institutions would have to carefully consider a number of significant factors. Briefly he stated that: First, because of the large amount of federal monies set aside for student and institutional aid it would be wise for states to coordinate their programs accordingly; Second, to insure that the program provides student access, the determination of the maximum award formula must be acceptable and understood by institutions, the public, and the state legislature; Third, what to do with the proprietary sector must be considered; Fourth, the increase in the desire of students to attend institutions on a part-time basis was a reality that should not be ignored; Fifth, careful deliberation

as to when the announcement of grant awards is to be made was considered vital in order to maximize student access to the program; Sixth, since most programs which have provided direct aid to students have been based on financial need, the issue of whether this need should be relative or absolute must be resolved; Finally, a long hard examination at the methods of holding independent institutions accountable for utilization of public funds must be taken to insure needs of students would not be "over-met."

A description of the close working relationship between the public, proprietary, and independent institutions of higher education within California was provided by Morgan Odell, Executive Director of the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities. This relationship according to Mr. Odell was based in general upon "an obvious self-interest to perform in this way."

In addition Mr. Odell discussed a study related to California's independent colleges and universities and their role in the state. The study, according to Mr. Odell, made a number of recommendations which served to promote the existence of a healthy independent sector. He stated that study authors believed hardy private colleges and universities were necessary to insure that students were to be provided as great as possible opportunity to attend a postsecondary institution of their choice and insure that diversity and constructive competition would continue to: provide a stimulus for innovation; encourage the most effective utilization of the state's postsecondary resources; and maintain a diverse range of postsecondary alternatives.

Rationale for a public policy concerned with independent post-

secondary education institutions was heard by conference attendees in a variety of arguments from several presenters. For example, Oklahoma's former Governor and current Senator, David A. Boren, emphasized the importance of a dual system of education and stated that he believed the private sector should play a vital role in this dual system. Louis Rabineau, Director of the Inservice Educational Project with the Education Commission of the States, argued that state support was necessary for several reasons. First, he stated private institutions were in their initial stages formed for public reasons, and second, that these institutions were an integral part of the American tradition. According to Mr. Rabineau, the third argument for independent institution support was in part based on the fact that the private sector offered "a wealth of educational and cultural opportunities that served to enrich the range of resources" in all of higher education. Finally, he concluded that private universities and colleges were an alternative to public control of higher education. Richard Jonsen declared in his presentation that an increase in competition for students and state resources by public and private colleges and universities and an increase in the demand for fiscal and educational accountability from higher education by the public and political leaders will inevitably result in an increase in the bureaucratic structure responsible for the planning, coordinating, and regulating of post-secondary education. Because of this, he went on to suggest, it is essential to create a clear state educational policy towards the independent sector.

Panel members told conferees of their concerns related to the development of a state policy for the independent sector. Some suggested that a determination must be made as to whether or not private colleges and universities actually are in need of funds and if so would it be appropriate to respond with tax dollars. Others questioned the impact state aid to the independent institutions would have on the identity of those institutions and whether or not this would be desirable for American society or students. Another concern raised in the conference was the issue as to the manner in which the independent institutions should be held accountable. As could be expected, comments on this issue ranged from the minimum to the maximum. Some stated that if accountability were to be equated to "bureaucratic" restrictions then the independent sector would be better off not participating. Others stated that independent colleges and universities should be held just as accountable as public institutions. All agreed the issue of accountability needed to be treated with great care and that the success of a state policy to foster the relationship between the public and independent sector was directly related to the treatment of this issue.

In general, suggestions for conferees were varied, cautious, and insightful. Florida's legislative leaders recognized that the state needed to develop in the near future some type of educational policy that would coordinate postsecondary educational planning in Florida and applauded the sincere interest of conference members and sponsors in the discussion of this sensitive subject. They

warned, however, that the legislature would, out of desperation, act alone if state officials and representatives from the independent sector could not agree as to what form the policy should take. In addition, several suggestions for aid programs were offered by speakers and in general took three forms: tuition equalization grants; direct institutional aid; and a broadening of eligibility to participate in the state's financial aid programs correlated to an increase in the funding of student aid.

Governor Boren asked that members consider what he thought was a difficult moral issue and claimed that without its resolution the problems which beset higher education would remain. The moral issue, he stated, involved the decrease within American society of a "spirit of community" and centered around society's fragmentation into special interest groups which look first to the acquisition of their share of the pie. He suggested that often these groups do not want to get together and that they frequently exhibit a lack of self-discipline. He believed that it was most important for the various higher education interest groups to come together to avoid unnecessary duplication; to share technology, laboratories, library collections; to plug the public into the decision-making process; and most of all to develop graduates that would be able to speak for the community.

Panel members and guest speakers put the largest share of the task to make state policy recommendations on to the Florida Post-secondary Education Commission. In fact, Florida's Commissioner of Education, Ralph Turlington, expects the Commission to make

recommendations related to this policy and stated that he would act upon these recommendations as soon as feasibly possible.

Certainly Florida can provide evidence that there is some degree of cooperation between the public and independent sector. For example, the Florida Postsecondary Education Commission has experienced a close cooperation between representatives of the independent, proprietary and public sectors in the overall duties of the Commission as well as within the sub-committee which planned the conference. There have also been changes in Florida's Student Assistance Grant program which have served to permit more students to receive aid to attend Florida's independent universities and colleges. In addition, Florida's State University System has requested funds to enter into contracts with the University of Miami and Barry College through which these institutions will receive State monies in exchange for providing program services in nursing and social work. However, it was clear to both participants and presenters that more would have to come in the future. If one common thought was developed as a result of this conference it would have to be the declaration that the time has arrived for Florida to attend to this important yet sensitive situation. The Florida Postsecondary Education Commission has recognized this need and has accepted the responsibility to make recommendations in this area to the Commissioner and the State Board of Education. Their task, as suggested by the testimony that follows, represents a real challenge.

"The Issues"

by

David L. Boren
U.S. Senator, Oklahoma

I think that before we begin to think about some of the issues that are involved, we must think for a minute about where we are now, where we are headed, and in what place we find ourselves. We have experienced a dramatic increase and of course are now leveling off in enrollments, in the field of higher education in most parts of the country during the past few years.

When you think about it, it took three-hundred years for us to reach the one million mark in total enrollment in higher education in the United States, from the early beginnings in the private sector, with the founding of Harvard. It took only thirty years for us to reach the second million and, incredibly, it took only two more years to reach the third million of enrollment in higher education in this country, which was in 1962. Now we're somewhere between 13 and 14 million. So, in twenty years, we exploded from 1 million, which took three-hundred years of growth, to somewhere in the neighborhood of 14 million in terms of total enrollment. At the same time, we have been experiencing other changes. Of course, the first three centuries of education in this country were dominated almost entirely by the private sector.

By 1960 we had reached the turning point where half of the university students were in private institutions and half were in public institutions. And since 1950 we have gone from the half and half mark to now, where 80 percent of all students in higher education in this country are being educated in the public sector. These shifts are somewhat interrelated because of the tremendous growth of enrollments. The public sector has the capability to tax and float bonds, and this is the reason it has the ability to keep pace with enrollments. Thus, it was inevitable that the public share of higher education in terms of enrollment would increase. The passage of the National Defense Education Act and the whole reaction to technological advances in the Eastern Block countries such as the launching of Sputnik brought about a push for more Federal Aid for graduate and research programs particularly in the scientific areas. This aid also helped the growth of the public sector because many private industries oriented toward a broad curriculum simply did not have the physical facilities, or the laboratory facilities, to take advantage of some of these programs. So we've been experiencing a trend toward rapid growth in the public sector partially through a shift in students from the private ones. We've also seen in this country in the field of higher education more and more specialization.

More than half of our students nationwide are part-time students. More than half of these are individuals who will not receive uninterrupted terminal degrees. This will lead to more and more specialized courses, more and more job-skill related courses and a

movement away from liberal arts. We are living through a time when this is inevitable, and it is proper in many respects that we are focusing more and more on the cost effectiveness of our programs. Enrollment has begun to level off in the past two years, and higher education has gained about six percent in terms of total appropriations over and above inflation, but that's not much improvement in terms of program improvement. I think we ought to realize that harder times are coming. When we look at what has happened to the national economy, when we look at the strain on the dollar, when we look at the trade imbalance and the magnitude of it, and when we see the rate of inflation, we see that we are headed for a period of reduced budgets. As we try to slow the growth of inflation, we all realize that we're going to have to justify the dollars we spend more and more. Thus, there is a real emphasis on trying to add programs that are cost-effective. With enrollment leveling off, there is more competition for students between institutions, and competition among the public and the private sector strictly for economic reasons. So there has been a temptation to offer courses that will appeal to the students so that you can directly state to the students: "Come to our institution, take this course of study because it will increase your earning power, or you're going to be able to get a job that will immediately need this kind of work when you graduate."

This particularly appeals to the typical horrified student who's coming back to college very often trying to increase earning power. So we get a move for more specialization; and a move toward a narrower

focus in our education. I think sometimes that all these issues we talk about cause us to lose sight of the biggest questions of all, and that is something I would like to address before we get into some of the detailed issues. When we talk about how we can be cost effective, what will be the distribution and relationship between the public and the private sector, and we talk about the kinds of programs that can be offered least expensively and interrelate back to skills, we talk about how we do it. It sometimes seems to me that we lose sight of what it is that we should be doing. That's got to be the first question we must answer. What is the greatest need, what is the central purpose, for our higher educational system in this country? What do we most need from our institutions of higher education as a society at this point in time? I think we have become too concerned sometimes about the distribution of funds, about the way in which we do something, and we forget to think about what it is we should be doing in the first place. By focusing on a formula, or by focusing on the cost effective one, we all too often overlook the first and underlying question. I hear speakers do this all the time.

I attended a conference not too long ago, at the Southern Growth Policy Board meeting in which a speaker talked about the regional problems of this country and spoke of two cities, Lowell, Mass. and Abilene, Texas. He told the tale about Lowell, which had an unemployment rate of about eighteen percent and losing population, and Abilene which was growing and has a three and one-half percent unemployment rate. He talked about a shrinking tax base in Lowell,

and he talked about the fact that in Lowell, thirty-eight percent of the people were receiving public assistance, whereas in Abilene only eight percent were. He really painted a picture of a city that was thriving and growing and developing as compared with one that was decaying, shrinking, and getting into deeper and deeper trouble. At the end of his remarks, he brought this all to a focal point of attention, and he said that the really cirtical problem facing this nation today was federal funding. How do we revise the federal funding formula to make sure that federal funds go to Lowell, where they are needed and not make their way to Abilene, where they are not needed. I couldn't help but think to myself that surely we've missed the whole point of the question which is, "Why is Abilene growing and thriving while Lowell is declining? How do we deal with the causes of what is going on, not how do we treat the symptoms?" And so it should be that we begin to think about the primary issues that face higher education today.

We must think first of all, what is it that we should be doing? What is it that society most demands from us today? I would say if I were to look around and from my experience over the past four years in the governor's office, that if there is anything that concerns me, as to what is happening in our country more than anything else, it's what I would describe as a collapse of the spirit of community in our society. You see it very clearly, for example, when you go through the budget making process. We have become organized into groups to try and get our share of the pie and to make sure that we get it. Our whole society has become organized

into groups of people around their interests, where they happen to live geographically, what their profession or occupation happens to be, and what their social or economic status or level may be. We see this so clearly in municipal government, where the policemen organize and strike to see if they can perhaps get their share and because the policemen organize, the firemen organize, and try to get their share. Because they do so, others do so, on and on and on. We see it all across the country, and I think one reason why our economy is so out of control is because everybody sits back and says "Look, since others are getting their share, we're demanding ours." Their is no willingness by the community to sit down and resort to some self-discipline or restraint and to sacrifice.

There is no feeling of mutual concern or understanding. We are becoming Balkanized in this country into geographical regions on all too many issues. I often wonder when I sit in the Governor's office and attend various meetings as I hear all the various groups and organizations. I often wonder if we could get together in an old fashioned New England town meeting again. What would it be like, and how would it compare in quality with the original kind of town meetings that were first held when everyone sat down and tried to determine what would be best for all of us, and say, "I see your point of view, and here is my interest. I'll compromise my interest and try to be fair to you." Who would get up in the town meeting if we had one today and speak for the entire community? We are absolutely paralyzed in this nation today with regard to making

decisions because we don't have that kind of experience, that perspective, that ability in our experience to see the other person's point of view.

We have had a collapse of decision-making. No wonder we have an urgent crisis in this country, for example, we're going to have to double the number of power plants to maintain full employment in the next nine years. It takes on the average about fourteen years to get a permit to build a power plant in this country of any type or variety. How in the world can we solve the problems? Even building our roads today in this country can create some political problems for the governor. It takes on the average about eighty-four months from the time the decision is made to build the road until the funds are finally released. Look what that does for the Governor. It's just terrible. It is a serious problem to rebuild this community and bring us together again as a country.

I happen to believe that at the heart of our political system is a great inconsistency. We believe in truly inconsistent philosophies without ever realizing it. If we were to take a poll and to ask, "Do you believe that the majority can rule, that decisions can be made in society by whichever side of the policy questions gets the most votes?", I think most of us in this room would say "yes." I believe in that principle. But on the other hand, if we were to say, "Should even the majority have the right to violate certain inalienable rights, such as the freedom of speech, the freedom of expression, the freedom of worship?", we

would hear people say "No, there are certain inalienable rights that can not be violated by anybody." Then you get down to the question of who decides and should majority rule. Well, if you let the majority decide when individual rights are violated, then we would have no protection at times, and so we believe in two inconsistent philosophies at the same time. Inalienable and individual rights and majority rule, which can certainly come into conflict. How have we been able to harmonize them all these years?

The Supreme Court has been one of the institutions that has tried to harmonize them, but basically we have been able to keep both of these principles together. Why? It's been because there has been a certain fairness that has usually prevailed with most people. We have usually had a fair and restrained community-minded majority that has been broad enough in perspective to see the right and needs of other individuals even if they were different, and even if they didn't happen to agree with them. That's what we are in danger of losing. If we lose that basic sense of consensus and fairness of community, or whatever you want to call it, then I think we're going to lose what we've built in this country. It's a great temptation for us in education to react more to the economic pressures, to react only to the needs of specialization as the top priority. I think we're on our way to becoming that way. How ironic it would be if we were to become the most federalized people in the world, and lose all we have because we didn't have an understanding of our own

interests, culture, and humanity?

What is the great need facing our educational system today? What should we be doing above all else? I believe very deeply and very sincerely that we must be broadly educating our students as the first and primary calling of higher education, so that we produce graduates with perspective and not with tunnel vision. So that we produce graduates who can speak for the community, and can speak from perspective and not just from a point of view of narrow specialization. And so, I expect to start from that point which hasn't changed from the beginning of our educational system but that still must be our primary mission. The development of the private sector must be maintained and why we must not allow it to be squeezed out is because historically those institutions have maintained a broad curriculum provision. They have also maintained the freedom that we have enjoyed in the public sector by ensuring academic freedom and the freedom of discussion for every graduate in the private sector. They have been free to experiment and we must maintain that kind of innovation, that kind of breadth, within our whole system of higher education.

Thus, we must decide what we should do and how we can best do it with limited resources. We've got to keep in mind that preservation of the private sector is extremely important for the total system, and that the classroom professor at the state institution should be just as vitally concerned about the preservation of the private sector as should be the professor at the private institution. How can we best do the job? By maintaining a broad perspective for

our students, by maintaining a healthy attitude toward our curriculum and how can we most effectively do it? How can we do it least expensively? And what are the problems we have had? What is it we need to decide to be doing? What are the issues and details which we are dealing with?

First of all, we cannot duplicate graduate programs as we've said over and over again. It is simply too expensive. I hope that all our institutions could maintain their broad base of curriculum for an outlook, so that we produce students who have the fundamentals of a broad liberal arts education and not sell out to the market and what the students themselves demand. Because if they perfected such a curriculum there would be no need for an institution in the first place. Once we have done that, how do we best and most effectively do the rest of it? We provide full-ranging programs and advanced programs, technical programs, and graduate programs, but we must first of all avoid duplication. It means not duplicating in one public institution the graduate programs of another, but it also means we must not have the public and the private sectors duplicating each other. In Oklahoma, we've tried to do this with our state system of higher education, the equivalent of your State Board of Regents, which receives money in lump sum and distributes it to the state institutions. The initiative for the creation of the state board in Oklahoma, by the way, came as much from the private institutions as from the public. The chairman of the first planning board, the first board that was set up to plan for effective higher education, was a president of one of

the private institutions in Oklahoma. The private institutions are numerous, and although they are not directly governed as to curriculum, or internal affairs, they are full-member institutions of the state higher education system in Oklahoma, and I think this should be true all over the country. Planning for higher educational programs is one coordinated effort with the public and private sectors participating. For example, if the state institutions are to approve the creation of a new law school, a new medical school, or a major thrust in the creation of a major college of either a public or private university, it must be approved through the process of the state regional board of higher education, even for the private sector. Now, why would the private sector agree?

Number one, for economic reasons. They are very concerned about other private institutions of lesser quality coming on the scene to take away students and compete with them or public institutions, so that the money is spread even thinner. Actually what you end up with instead of seven or eight or ten viable, high caliber, quality private institutions, you have twenty watered-down programs or end up with twenty units that are not able to survive economically. Thus, planning is the "certificate of need" in these programs. Now you can't run out and build a hospital or a nursing home anymore in the medical field because you have to study the impact on the cost of beds, or unoccupied beds, or the cost of the whole field. And what are you going to do if that's the certificate of need? In essence that's the way we

look at the whole educational system in Oklahoma. Basically, it is not a means to intrude in the innovations of the private sector but simply is more a means of protecting the private sector. So you must have your plans. You must avoid duplications. There is no excuse for a state institution to begin to offer in the same community a graduate program that's already offered by a private institution on a basis of excellence, so that in essence it puts the private institution out of business. Obviously, it would be foolish for the private sector to duplicate what the public sector is already doing.

I would hope that we could still build areas of excellence on a very selective basis, each institution looking to the faculty, and its unique resources. Certainly, there are graduate programs that are stronger at some institutions than at others. This has to do with faculty recruitment, the attitude of the institution towards growth, and we build on those. We should build areas of excellence in graduate programs, and plan together with the public and private sectors to avoid duplication, and enter into some contractual relationships for shared services. If you're in the same area, let students from the public institution take certain kinds of programs at the private and vice versa as we have done in Oklahoma.

There are institutions both public and private that have interchangeable credit hours. They can move back and forth to a certain extent in the taking of courses. In addition, we have ten private institutions that participate with the public in-

stitutions in sharing technology and also basic capital outlay. We have a top-ranked television system in all our major institutions in the state. This is a shared cost between both sectors which participate in it. The state builds a relay tower and the trasmitter there is a joint expenditure in terms of the studio, and in maintenance of the system and so on. There are other examples of shared laboratory and shared library facilities between the private and public institutions in the state. I think that it is very, very important that we begin to share some of these costly features, and, by the way, there is a tremendous amount of sharing between the private institutions themselves.

I used to teach at a Baptist related institution in Oklahoma, Oklahoma Baptist University, down the street from St. Gregory College which is a Catholic institution. We kept it very quiet, but for example, in the interrelated curriculum, other than sharing the library and other facilities, the Baptists would be teaching Greek to the Catholics and the Catholics would be teaching Latin to the Baptists. So, we have a good deal of this going on in our state, probably most efficiently, and it is a healthy and good thing. Sometimes this goes into sharing facilities. Other examples include computer services and technical service programs. We have a student aid program that has begun to help the students. I think this is more preferable than direct aid to private institutions because the private institutions would be spurred into too many categorical grant programs. However, through the state program

which aids the individual student, he can use the funds to go to either a public or a private institution that is recognized and is a member of the state system of higher education. Generally, the following issues are ones which must be addressed to preserve the vitality of the private sector.

We've got to stop adding new programs all the time, in both the public and the private sectors. One of the things that is threatening is that funds are taken up by the programs that the institutions want to start. What we are going to have to recognize is that if we are going to have new programs with the same amount of dollars, and have inflation as we did the years before, that the new programs must be good ones, and some we don't need must be terminated. These are hard and tough choices, very tough choices. It really makes them angry when I get an agenda of all the new programs, and I ask for the other papers with all the old programs we want to discontinue, so we don't just water down what we already have. We ought to make these tough choices and be honest with ourselves when we start new programs. And just remember this: it is a lot easier to develop new programs than it is to discontinue the old programs. Because you already have all those faculty members, all the people who want to maintain the status quo and keep comfortable. And so we have to move with extreme caution. I'm not saying we should never create new programs; of course, we've got to adapt to the times. We can't be like the lady who avoids daylight savings time because it wasn't designed that way in the first place, and it would cause her garden to burn

up with that extra hour of sunlight! We've got to adapt but remain very cautious.

We have got to relate to the needs of society. We're turning out too many teachers, for example, and most states agree that we can't absorb them, and it really galls me that to go into pre-law or into pre-med and in other preprofessional programs, you must have a good gradepoint average and pass a thorough interview. However, only half of these capabilities are required to go into education. To teach our children, we don't want just anyone to be admitted, and if they have the easiest courses of all, we're going to have to up standards. When they ask why, we all know why, because what will we do with all of those faculty members in the school of education. We've got the innovations, and one of the things we might consider doing that would help teachers out in the field, and the faculty members too, would be instead of sitting back in the office, to have more contact with the classrooms they train people to go into. Why not really give the college of education and faculty there the chance to develop in-service education in the schools right across the state? What a wonderful interchange for both! So there are ways of dealing with the problems, of introducing what already is existing, without saying we are going to train twice as many teachers as we need. There are ways to utilize the talents of the faculty in a way that will help everybody, including themselves.

We've also got to get away from the brick and mortar syndrome and this has to do with shared facilities between the public and

private institutions. We can't go around building these great monuments like we've been doing in the past. Educators, highway builders, architects, engineers and others, all wanted a $300 million state bond issue in Oklahoma and we had to put someting into it for every community in the state in order to get votes over here and votes over there. This happens on a statewide basis to get the necessary votes for passage. In this case, with a $300 million bond issue, they forgot we had $80 million of growth revenue, in other words, we had about $80 million new dollars for all purposes in that budget for the next year. We've got to take away $10 million from that $80 million to serve the bond issue if it passes. We're down to $70 million. It takes about twenty percent of the cost of a capital structure to maintain it. So, twenty percent roughly per year is used to maintain the capital structure. If we build it, then let's use it. Well, twenty percent of the $300 million (60 million), and we're already down to 70 million, then there is only about $10 million left to pay additional costs in state government. Well, we've got to re-orient ourselves and see how it would be to have selection in these areas in which we have decided to build our programs of excellence.

We've got to maintain the strict goal of training others for the future phase out of old programs. We've got to be prepared for change, and be prepared for new roles. Heaven forbid the faculty members who would have to do that, or have to change jobs, or have to face a new occupation temporarily. The program would have to be phased out or what if ninety percent of the faculty had

tenure and new programs were needed. We have to face some of these tough issues. Thus, if we want to have the funds to operate at all, to perform all of these roles, we have to be able to work together effectively, public and private sectors together, and it is good from the point of view of society and it is practical politics. You've got to become more effective translators of knowledge to the public and to the decision makers. Our institutions need to plug themselves into the political process of where decisions are being made so that the knowledge which is available from our greatest institutions is used by the policy makers to make decisions.

My first year in the legislature, twelve years ago in Oklahoma, I can remember I was working on the environmental policy committee. We were trying to decide whether or not to ban phosphates from the detergents sold in Oklahoma. I received answers daily from all sorts of people. But I remember hearing from others as well, and nobody knew what a phosphate was, and they didn't know how to decide on the issue. Now we were making a decision. One would say, "Well, what does your wife do? Does Duz really make it brighter?" That was the level of our expertise. People all across the state were calling the universities. They may or may not be industry oriented or environmentally oriented, but it would help us approach the problem from a more objective point of view. One thing we've built is an area of resources. Now we've got to build a directory of resources among all the public and private institutions of those people and those faculties that have expertise in certain areas to do research for public policy making. We must put that directly in the hands

of our public policy makers, and our legislators. The more that it was used, a rubbing of shoulders took place between the public policy makers and the academics. It is much better for the appropriations process of higher education, and for our private institutions as well. I know when I was trying to get the tuition grant program, that would include both public and private higher education, there were faculty members who began to serve as staff members in order to learn about a particular problem. They talked about institutions and the state of the individual campuses. All sorts of relationships were formed, which translated into additional dollars at the time. It simply works because it was practical politics. Just think how much better the quality of the decisions will be. We can decide about phosphates without worrying whether the detergent is better or brighter if we have information to go on.

And so we need translators. There are all sorts of areas which we have discussed concerning the making of policies in higher education. We must work together because there are some pitfalls which the public and private sector must both avoid if we're going to be able to fulfill our primary mission. Again, I end where I started, we must not let utility, in the narrow sense of the term, set the curriculum. Aristotle said, when he was asked about the difference between being educated and uneducated, "the difference was the same as being alive and being dead." We must not set a curriculum which will leave them intellectually dead and unaware of themselves and their own humanity. One of the most important

reasons why the public and private sectors must work together, and why the private sector must be preserved, can be expressed through Rousseau's statement about the right of the majority to rule. When he talked about the general will to prevail, he spoke of the difficulty in maintaining the general will. In fact, he believed it could be done on the basis of a small city-state, where people could more or less get to know each other personally, firsthand. Let us never forget how difficult that task is, and how fragile the fabric of our society is. It must be guarded and be protected. The only way to keep it is to make sure that the spirit of community is preserved and maintained, and the challenge all of us have together is this. When we think about the town meeting being reconvened, and when the question is asked, "Who will get up and speak for this community about economics or whatever," who will get up and speak for the entire community? Who has the sense of perspective, the sense of values that will lead him or her to speak to the entire community? Let us hope that we can maintain a system of higher education, public and private, so that together we can say that our graduates are prepared, equipped, and ready to speak for the community.

Thank you very much.

"State Policies and Programmatic Implementation"

by

Richard W. Jonsen
Senior Staff Associate
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

States have been active in developing policies with respect to the nonpublic sector of postsecondary education since about 1960. Those policies should not be perceived as static. The social, demographic, economic, and political environment in which they have been developed is anything but static. Thus, this conference, which seeks to reconsider the relationships of the public and nonpublic sectors, is particularly appropriate. It presumes new conditions and the need to re-appraise policies in light of those conditions.

Your conference theme includes consideration of all nonpublic higher education. Used this way nonpublic includes all institutions of higher education that are not primarily funded by government appropriations or controlled by publicly appointed boards. The nonpublic sector embraces both private-independent and "proprietary" profit making institutions. I'll try to use the two terms independent or proprietary in situations that refer specifically to one or the other, and use nonpublic where both are concerned.

State Interest and Nonpublic Higher Education

All states but one support independent institutions or

students attending them. This is ample evidence of state interest in the nonpublic sector. In some states, such support takes several forms. The bedrock of state policy must be a clear understanding of the state goals for postsecondary education, and the contribution that nonpublic institutions--independent and proprietary--make towards the achievement of those goals. Higher education policies are needed that consider the appropriate roles of public, independent, and proprietary institutions.

The two key questions that should guide the development of such policies, as they affect nonpublic higher education are:

- What are the general policy objectives for postsecondary education within the state?
- What is the role of nonpublic colleges and universities, and how do they contribute to the accomplishment of those objectives?

From that perspective there are really no policies toward the nonpublic sector, but only state policies that affect the nonpublic sector. The well being or the survival of individual institutions, or even an entire segment of institutions, is not the primary focus of policy development, but only the secondary result of policies primarily intended to achieve the established goals for postsecondary education--the provision of educational opportunity of high quality; assuring equity, diversity, and efficiency.

Assessing the contributions made by the nonpublic sector to the achievement of those goals requires intimate knowledge of the size, nature, role, complexity, and health of the nonpublic sector, as well as recognition that its contribution changes over time. For

example, in times of rapid enrollment growth the nonpublic sector may make a contribution to public goals of absorbing additional students with minimal state support, a contribution that may be less significant in times of declining enrollment. With the foregoing points in mind, I'd like to talk about three set of policy issues: planning issues, financing issues, and accountability.

Statewide Planning and Coordination, and the Involvement of the Nonpublic Sector

The independent sector, and to some extent, the proprietary sector, have been effective in securing beneficial policies through legislative process. Increasing competition in higher education for students and resources, and increasing demands for accountability from the public and from political leaders, will surely mean increases in the bureaucratic structures responsible for planning, coordinating, and regulating of postsecondary education. This means that the nonpublic sectors will need to develop the same capacity for working with such structures as for working with legislatures and governors.

This depends, of course, on the character, responsibility, and authority of the state structure, but it also depends upon the way in which the nonpublic sectors are organized. Let me make several points about that organization:

1. Associations representing nonpublic institutions (such as ICUF and FAPS) must be willing to invest organization and energy in developing relationships with state

structures.

2. Statewide agencies and institutional associations must recognize the importance of both formal and informal working relationships.
3. Care should be taken to provide appropriate representation (through membership, observers, or staff liaison) in the work of coordination and planning, whether that takes place at the level of the board, its committees, or its staff.
4. This means that the nonpublic sectors must be well organized not only to provide such representation, but also to provide the extensive data collection and position articulation that supports it.

Jay Chronister of the University of Virginia has recently surveyed state postsecondary agencies and associations of independent institutions about their planning relationships. The survey returns emphasize the importance of the quality of those relationships. This places responsibility on both state agencies and associations to work seriously to develop positive and productive relationships.

In Maryland, where state policies provide effective support to the independent institutions, there is an extensive network of relationships between the State Board for Higher Education and the Independent College and University Association--through formal membership on the "segmental advisory committee" to the Board, as well as committees and task forces at every level of policy develop-

ment and decision making. These formal and informal arrangements appear to have engendered cordial working relationships between the State Board and the Association. I am convinced that, in the future, such relationships will be an indispensible prerequisite to effectiveness at the legislative level. I emphasize these planning relationships also because I believe that many of the central issues of the next few years for the nonpublic sectors will be essentially planning issues. Let me illustrate this point by mentioning four of these issues:

First, to what extent should the nonpublic sector be involved in the statewide review of new and existing programs? This is a complex issue, involving the purpose of such reviews, the nature of existing arrangements for program review, the authority of the agency that carries out the review, and the extent to which the nonpublic sector enjoys the support of the state. If it is the case that program review seeks to insure the quality of the state's resources for higher education, and the efficiency with which they are utilized, then you should consider the involvement of the nonpublic sector in that activity. If the nonpublic sector is seen as contributing to the achievement of state goals for postsecondary education, then you should recognize the resources of the nonpublic when considering program development in the public sector. By the same reasoning, it seems logical to consider the resources of the public sector when developing programs in nonpublic institutions.

I recognize that the fiscal relationship between state govern-

ment and nonpublic institutions--the extent to which state appropriations support these institutions or their students--is an important factor in decisions about the role of the nonpublic sector in program review.

A second issue is, how can resources be shared among public and independent sectors? Several states (including Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, as well as Florida) provide for contracts between the state and independent institutions to develop services that meet public needs by utilizing the facilities of nonpublic institutions.

In spite of those arrangements, genuine resource sharing between public agencies or institutions and nonpublic institutions can hardly be called extensive. If state policies facilitate such practice, both legislation and administrative action should promote it. The agency responsible for developing and administering these contractual arrangements can bring this about by imaginatively seeking opportunities for efficient use of state resources through means of such contracts.

Issue three, how will the independent sector be involved in policies relating to the provision of learning opportunities for adults? Because of the decline in the size of traditional college-aged population, increased attention has been placed on "nontraditional" clientele and "nontraditional" modes of delivery of instructional services. If the pattern of subsidies for these activities in public institutions is changed, then that will affect the way in which the resources of nonpublic institutions

are used to render these services. Few new policies have been developed that effectively settle the questions of financing, allocation of function, allocation of "territory," and control of quality, in the provision of learning opportunities for adults. The development of such policies needs to involve the nonpublic sector and take its resources into consideration.

Issue four, how should policies relating to role and scope of institutions accomodate the nonpublic sector? Historically, most of this type of planning--master planning--has concerned public institutions. If state policy considers a "system" of postsecondary opportunity, some of which is provided by nonpublic institutions--then the incorporation of the independent sector in role and scope planning should follow. This is not a bland and inconsequential exercise. Role and scope planning will grapple with some of the toughest issues of the steady state, because, if done correctly, it will involve serious institutional redefinition of mission. Obviously, the link between such planning and institutional response will be stronger and more direct in the public sector than the nonpublic. But the policy recommendations made by resolute and imaginative postsecondary planning agencies to nonpublic institutions, and the inducements provided to follow those recommendations, may be one of the most effective future devices to improve resource utilization in the total "system" of postsecondary education. Of course, by far the most important planning "issue" is the question of whether, how and to what extent the state provides financial support for the nonpublic

sector.

What is the Appropriate Role of the State in the Financing of Nonpublic Institution?

States employ several methods to support nonpublic institutions or the students attending them. The most current surveys by ECS and the National Association of State Scholarship and Grant Programs indicate that every state with an independent sector operates, at least, a student aid program for students attending independent institutions. (In 22 states, not including Florida, these grants can be used to attend proprietary institutions.) Nine states have programs of general purpose direct institutional aid to independent institutions and in three more states institutional aid follows financial aid recipients. Other programs of institutional aid are categorical: for medical education, programs for disadvantaged students, contracts for specific services, and the support of specific institutions.

There is extensive support for need-based student aid as the primary vehicle for state support of independent higher education. The ECS Task Force on State Policy and Independent Higher Education recommended that "states give first consideration to the development of need-based student grant programs, funded at levels adequate to provide students with real choice among institutions." Breneman and Finn, in their study for the Brookings Institution, also emphasized adequate student aid grants through the coordination of state and federal programs, with the latter encouraging "increased

outlays devoted to student aid. . .(S)tudent choice among colleges will have been enhanced. The higher education marketplace will have become a more reliable guide to resource allocation, and those private colleges that compete successfully for students will have received public aid in a manner that minimizes the threat to their autonomy" (p. 432).

Passage of the Federal Middle Income Student Assistance Act is an appropriate occasion for state re-appraisal of student aid policies. Since middle income students can now be helped by BEOG, it can be regarded as providing subsistence for a significant portion of students. State programs can be directed at variable tuition costs. A maximum BEOG will provide an eligible student with "typical" room and board expenses at a Florida college or university. The $1,200 maximum Student Assistance Grant (1977-78) will then cover about half of the tuition at the typical independent institution, or about one third of that at a higher-priced independent institution. Family contribution, institutional aid, and SEOG, loans and other self help (including work-study) can make up the balance. State decision makers need to determine what portion of the cost of tuition in the nonpublic sector the need-based student aid program should cover. Thus, the new federal legislation should help state level decision makers determine appropriate levels for state student aid programs, because the expanded BEOG provides a more effective foundation for comprehensive student aid "packages"; and liberalized SEOG, CWS, and GSL provide greater confidence that other aid, coupled with

family support and self help, can complete a package whose foundation is BEOG and state student aid.

State policy makers may wish to consider the possibility that the increase in federal appropriations for student aid, and the liberalization of their eligibility rules, may make it possible for the federal-state-institutional partnership to assure, for the first time, that every eligible student has adequate financial aid to attend the institution - public or nonpublic - that best meets his or her needs.

Consideration of the procedures required to achieve this would involve:

- Calculation of the implications of new federal student aid levels, given the income characteristics of Florida students, and the educational charges of its institutions.
- Determination of the unmet need that will remain after federal aid is awarded.
- Consideration of the extent to which the state program should meet that unmet need, and the fiscal impact of doing so:

This means that the central policy questions are: What should the maximum award level be, and, if all "needy" students cannot be aided, how should awards be rationed? Presently, Florida's average awards are relatively high ($1063) and they appear to go to those students with the largest need. If award levels were raised to about the average tuition at nonpublic institutions ($2,200 to $2,400) and if the number of students who could be aided were in-

creased, then you would be:

1. Making more efficient use of the foundation provided by federal student aid programs.
2. Providing an improved higher education "market" by reducing the distance between public and nonpublic tuitions for many students.
3. Encouraging more efficient use of the resources of the nonpublic sector; and,
4. Assuring maximum choice, among institutions, for students on all income levels.

The maximum award level is a critical state policy decision; states should consider pegging their level to some portion of tuition costs in independent institutions. By doing so, the state is making a decision about the value of student choice.

There are several other issues that involve development of effective policies of support to the nonpublic institutions, or to students attending them.

The first of these issues, is, how should need be determined? Most states follow CSS or ACT guidelines in determining need. Inadequate attention has been given to the fact that it is these schedules--because of the heavy expectations they make with respect to contributions from middle class families--that are largely responsible for the so-called middle income squeeze. David Breneman writing, in the October issue of Change magazine, said that "these financial need formulas, rather than being 'scientific' and beyond criticism are fraught with necessarily arbitrary and debatable

judgments." It is hardly necessary to abandon the concept of need-based aid in order to provide relief to middle income families with children in college. It would simply be necessary to adjust need analysis schedules to require smaller family contributions in the middle and upper middle income ranges and possible to allow awards slightly in excess of total demonstrated need. Such programs would be as effective as tax credits and much more efficient, since there would be no additional cost to the state at lower and higher income levels. I recognize, however, that because state programs are tied in the national system, and interrelate with need determination in the federal programs, this cannot be a unilateral policy determination.

If Student Assistance Grants are aimed at widening student choice, the eligibility of students attending proprietary institutions to receive these grants should be considered. Because of the difficulties that beset federal programs where institutional eligibility includes proprietary institutions, and such policy should be developed with emphasis upon assuring the quality and responsibility of eligible institutions. The Florida Association of Private Schools would undoubtedly wish to assist in developing such rules.

Should non-need based student aid (sometimes called tuition offsets) be available to aid independent higher education? Several states have now enacted programs of student aid that provide grants to students attending independent institutions irrespective of family means. Questions that should be asked before such a policy

is adopted include:

1. What state objectives are met by such a program?
2. Would these grants have the effect of changing the distribution of students between public and nonpublic institutions, and among low and high cost institutions? How high would subsidies need to be in order to have these effects?
3. Would tuition offsets permit independent institutions to concentrate their recruitment efforts on students from more affluent families, and would this be consistent with state policies with respect to access?
4. Would these grants be perceived as a way of indirectly providing cost of education subsidies to independent institutions, of a sort provided to public institutions, and if that is so, would it be preferable to provide such subsidies directly to institutions?
5. And most importantly, if such subsidies are intended to improve student choice, and students are aided who would have attended their institution in any case, is the cost producing important benefits to the state?

Direct Support to Independent Institutions

Seven states provide direct, general purpose support to independent institutions. Five more states use contracts as a vehicle for general institutional support, or for support related to enrollment of low income students. A number of other states provide categorical

institutional grants. Such programs demonstrate the importance to the state of the survival and quality of the independent sector. These programs may also signify an emphasis upon centralized higher education planning instead of what I would call a "fair" market approach. Institutional aid programs must be carefully based upon an understanding of the way in which the independent sector contributes to the achievement of state purposes for higher education, upon an intimate understanding of the nature of the independent sector, and upon its general and fiscal well being.

A couple of concluding words about programs of support. The composition of an aid program should be based squarely upon a clear understanding of state goals with respect to postsecondary education, and the role nonpublic institutions play in achieving them. Because these two elements differ from state to state, there is clearly no prescription that could guide state policy makers in developing an adequate mix of programs.

Having said this, I also want to emphasize the primacy of need based student aid. Student aid enhances opportunity by widening student choice. Adequately financed student aid programs, with high enough award ceilings are clearly effective--for example, in California, New York, and Illinois, both in providing access to nonpublic institutions for students from lower and middle income families, and, as a consequence, contributing to institutional health.

John Folger calculated that if you raised your award ceiling

to $1,800, and if this resulted in about twenty-five percent of your independent sector students receiving $1,500 awards, the cost, over and above the Student Assistance Grant dollars now going to independent institutions (this assumes the new awards would be limited to tuition costs) might be about eighteen million dollars.

I believe this would represent about four percent of your total expenditures for higher education.

It would purchase:

1. Fairer competition between public and independent institutions.
2. The chance for more students to choose the institution that best suits their needs and interests.
3. Efficient use of the resources of the independent sector at a cost, on the part of the state, that is quite small in proportion to its total higher education expenditures.

Accountability

The recognition of the public function served by the nonpublic sector of higher education, as well as increasing governmental support, inevitably means that nonpublic institutions will increasingly be accountable to state agencies, for their performance and for their use of tax funds.

Earl Cheit said recently that "it cannot be assumed that dual standards of accountability will survive indefinitely with public funds to the private sector."

The policy questions involved are:

1. Who will monitor the accountability of the independent sector? ECS recommends, quite appropriately, that the responsibilities be vested in the state agency for postsecondary education.
2. Should accountability to the state be broader than accountability for responsible use of state funds? The argument of public functions made by the independent institutions themselves may also carry the conclusion that the institutions need to be accountable, in a general way at least, for all their resources used in serving the public interest. This suggests the possibility of independent sector involvement in program review and other procedures for assessing responsible and responsive service.

There is little unanimity with respect to the meaning of accountability for the nonpublic sector. But it is likely that working out that meaning, in a way that is appropriate and sensitive to the interests both of the state and of the institutions, will be a challenging area of policy development in coming years.

Conclusion

The coming decade is sure to be turbulent and difficult for higher education. Few significant issues will be resolved without contention. It will be hard to keep the public interest foremost, as institutions and sectors struggle for position and resources.

But the contribution of the nonpublic sector to the state goals for postsecondary education are such that decision makers must consider both the interest and voice of the independent and proprietary institutions as state policy is developed with respect to the foregoing issues. Those sectors must be adequately organized and prepared to engage in the development of state policies in a cooperative and constructive spirit, a spirit which, widely enough shared, will ameliorate some of the negative possibilities in the future environment of postsecondary education.

That cooperative spirit, however, will of itself not be enough. It is also necessary--critically important--that the policies and programs that are developed in response to these issues be initiated in the context of a plan or a comprehensive approach. Such a plan should consider the public educational needs and objectives, and how the resources--of both public and independent institutions--can be most effectively and efficiently utilized to meet these needs and achieve these objectives.

Thank you.

SECTION II

Case Study: Pennsylvania

by

Edward McGuire
Chancellor
Massachusetts Board of Higher Education

Let me talk very briefly about Pennsylvania. I am very delighted to be at this particular conference because it is one subject that I have had a great deal of concern about. I have found that in most of Pennsylvania and Massachusetts that there exists a raging debate about how public money will unfold into private institutions.

In Pennsylvania we have one formula and in Massachusetts we have another. I think it would be a mistake if you do not realize that such a policy arises out of a political climate. Out of this climate comes the profound educational question as to the value, if you will, of public dollars going into private institutions. I have always agreed with those who argue that some type of formula is in the best interest of higher education in general.

The question as I see it, is really whether or not we are going to continue to perpetuate the myth of private or independent institutions of higher education just because that myth is worth perpetuating. It means that there is an argument as to whether

or not there really are independent institutions other than those that are strictly proprietary. For example, depending upon who you talk to, in Massachusetts we are told that 50% to 75% of MIT's budget comes from public money, an enormous impact of dollars. One gets the same type of report from Harvard, in that about fifty percent, comes from public dollars.

So we really need to raise the question at some time in the near future, whether or not they are independent. But if they are not, then is it in our best interest to pretend that they are? My answer to that has always been an emphatic yes! This yes has come out of a various number of different directions. The most important direction being the old competitive enterprise of public and private higher education. Having one sector of higher education that can do things differently, take a different path, and a different approach to education, is indeed a very valuable tool to have.

I found that when I was dealing with private institutions of higher education their approach to education would take on a completely different nuance in many respects, than that in public higher education. This I applaud. I find public higher education interested and concerned with things in which private higher education is not interested nor concerned with, and that I applaud. But the problem is, how do we get both of these sections together for the best interest of general higher education in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts or the state of Florida, a very difficult problem.

Pennsylvania has attempted to do this and to bring them together in various ways. The first, and probably the most important

way that Pennsylvania has attemped, is to do it as direct aid to the student. The philosophy in Pennsylvania that has been expressed in conferences and by many of the professional organizations concerned about the survival of private institutions, is that we ought to put money in the hands of the student, the consumer. Let the consumer take that money and shop around where he or she sees fit and go to the institution that fits his or her basic needs, goals, and objectives. Out of this will come the survival of the fittest. Kind of the old 1800, if you will, Andrew Carnegie approach to rugged individualism and capitalism.

To this end, Pennsylvania has set up what is called the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Corporation. That corporation will probably pump about $72 - $75 million a year into the student market as direct grants. About $68 million comes from the State Treasury. The rest is made up of Federal dollars and earnings. In addition, Pennsylvania has developed an Institutional Assistance Grant (IAG) program. This year Institutional Assistance Grant funding of Pennsylvania reached $12.6 million. This is based on a formula. Policy which directs this program is based upon every time a student takes some money from the Commonwealth of Pennsyvlania, and enters a private institution with that money, that there is a direct cost that private institution has to bear to educate the Pennsyvlania student. What the Legislature did was provide that for every student who desired to enter a private institution with Pennsyvlania grant money, they would give that institution $400 or there abouts to cover the direct costs -

the administrative and teaching part - of educating that young person. The point of it is really very simple. Pennsylvania simply takes the money made available by the Legislature, and this year they indicated 12.6 million, and divide it by the numbers of students who have received grants from private institutions. They then divide out the available money, up to $400 per student. This year, for the first time, each institution will receive $400 per student. In previous years they fell short, but they never fell under $300. This is the first year that they will reach the maximum as quoted by the legislature ($400 per student).

Pennsylvania has also started to move back into direct aid to private institutions. There are thirteen private institutions in the Commonwealth which have received direct dollars from the State Treasury. There are four private medical schools that in its wisdom the Legislature way back when, now about fifteen years ago, decided that they needed to help to support the State's private medical schools pay off an accrued financial liability. Subsequently, on a formula per student basis, the State issued some money to each of the private medical schools. The most expensive as I recall being Thomas Jefferson University which received about $6 million.

There were also nine other private institutions that received direct State aid. (Private means that they are not state-controlled. The Board of Trustees is not controlled by public appointees) The nine institutions run the gamut from the University of Pennsylvania

which received about $13 million of.State aid last year, right down to the Philadelphia College of Textile and Science which received $250,000 last year.

Now to confuse and compound the problem in Pennsylvania, we have three institutions that, except during budget times, say they are private. They are Temple University, The University of Pittsburgh and Pennsylvania State University. For fifty-one weeks out of the year they are private institutions. For one week out of the year they are public institutions. This was recorded directly from the state, and the state knows that they are public but they do not bother them.

Thus in Pennsylvania we have basically a four pointer system. First, we have a state-owned system which receives from the treasury virtually all of its money. These are the fourteen state colleges which were one time teacher colleges and are now trying to grow up and be something else. Second, we have the state-related, which are Pennsylvania State, Temple and Pittsburgh. Most of what they receive comes from the state. As I recall the last figure for those three institutions was something like $350 million. Third, there is the community college system which receives one-third from tuition, and one-third from a local sponsor. Finally, we have our thirteen which are private institutions, called state-aided because they get several million dollars from the state. Well, that gives you a

rough summary of what is being accomplished.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts is not nearly so sophisicated in support of its private institutions. We simply have an aid program. We have $13 million of direct aid to students based on need, and the law says that seventy-five percent of that state aid must go to students who attend private institutions. So we have twenty-five percent of that $13 million that can be spent on students who attend public institutions. The other seventy-five percent has to be spent on the students who attend private institutions. There is one small postscript to that which I always have to bring before educators. Massachusetts is of only four states that allows money to be migrated out. Students could take their money and give it to a private institution in Florida if they so chose without penalty. Perhaps other states should be aware of this, and perhaps it will change some of their bad habits. Mr. Chairman, that summarizes Pennsylvania and Massachusetts. I will be glad at the end of the period of time to answer any questions.

Case Study: Illinois

by

Joseph Boyd
Executive Director
Illinois State Scholarship Commission

There are a variety of responses that can be made: from a student need-based aid; direct aid; tuition equalization; and direct grants. I guess my role this morning would be to relate my responses to the activities found in my own state of Illinois, and as I see it on the national scene.

In this current academic year on a nation-wide basis, there is no question that more states have elected the need-based student grant approach than any other alternative. All states and territories in this current year have helped 1.25 million students to receive funds divided in small amounts of state dollars. The grant total for the nation has reached $829 million. Built in most of the programs, if not all, is the characteristic of not letting the state award exceed the cost of tuition. Florida added this concept to their program last year.

I trust you may know exactly where the State of Florida stands in the picture today, and I want to share with you then some comments about my own state. Florida was one of the earlier southern states to get involved in a need-based student aid program. Your program is evolving. One of the greatest frustrations

you must have is that you see so much potential, you hear these large figures from other places, and wonder how you might magically overnight be where you want to be. Possibly with conferences like this one you will be able to make decisions as to where you are and where you want to be.

But, if you are interested, Florida ranks twenty-third in the country in terms of the number of awards which you made based on need. In terms of total dollars, Florida ranks 16th, and in terms of the dollars in your need-based student aid program for your 1976 population, you ranked 28th. I calculate that approximately $1.10 per each Florida resident or citizen is put into your need-based student aid program. On a national basis it is $3.84.

Let me put these figures aside and discuss our program in Illinois. It also started out small. It started out with the assumption that certain students with needs should be helped. We were talking in those days of maybe 1000 a year at a $600 maximum. But over time it has grown to where in the current year it is over $84 million. We are helping 97,000 students. It has grown to the place where we try to respond to a very delicate necessity in an arena we all share.

We try to respond to the separate priorities of guaranteering both access and reasonable choice. Both points of view must be in your planning for both political reasons and for what I think is sound government. We are to the point that over sixty percent of all those at public four year, and about eighteen percent of all students attending community colleges receive need-based aid.

The need-based student aid program opens college doors to both the full and half-time students. It represents a response to all citizens regardless of where they stand in their academic accomplishments. It means that at least some level of post-secondary education is available to help students fulfill their future. The program, at least as we see things, is very responsive to those who want more higher education.

It may or may not shock you to realize now that sixty percent of all my applications are from women. Forty-two percent of all my applications are from minority groups. Twenty percent are from individuals over twenty-five years of age.

I think as master planners if you affirm a dual system which will include all the things found today in postsecondary education, you have to think through how you will go from where you are now and where you want to be. First, you have to be very sensitive, and think this state has been, as I understand how you calculated your grants, to coordinate with Federal financial aid. If you have read the papers, you know we have made a most dramatic break-through in terms of what Congress has said and the President has signed in terms of the role of the basic grant program. Never in your history will you have such a base to build from as this. What was at one time a rather modest attempt by the Federal government to provide aid to low income students now appears as an attempt to, in my analysis, reach maybe as much as ninety percent or more of all the families that are reaching out for postsecondary education, with some level of basic educational opportunity grant or assistance.

So the time is right for any state, such as yours, that may have not yet funded itself at the level to have the impacts you want, to use these new federal powers, analyze their impact by sector and by individual families, and build on that base to accomplish the purposes that you most want to add to your program. In many cases, such as in my state, having gradually accomplished over time many of the goals, it may shock you that I must tell you, that our needs for state funding will be less next year because of the increase in limits of the federal basic grant. So we will adjust to accomplish additional purposes that remain after the federal dollars are in place.

It is very important to separate the various ways to deal with issues as they affect reasonable choice or access. Maximum award, let me start with this. There is no question that it has to be finely turned, because it is very sensitive in terms of the cost students bear. Some kind of formula needs to be worked out based on the accessibility of loans and understood by all concerned parties. Illinois' maximum award has grown over time from about $600 in the beginning, to a current $1650. I am convinced states can have too low as well as too high a maximum in relationship to what they want to accomplish. As you decide maximum, I am convinced that you have to be very concerned about the inflationary possibilities. More cost to students than is actually needed could develop. In Illinois we simply decided by formula that our maximum should be sixty-five percent of the tuition that students pay at privates. We have recently dealt

with a similiar figure which is ninety percent of the difference between what students are paying at private two and four year institutions verses the tuition paid at public senior institutions.

Now, one of the measures in which we delight is that we have stabilized the enrollments between the public and all the private schools in our state. We think this is one way to have a policy which forces institutions to equally share the situations of enrollment growth or enrollment decline. This has convinced us that at least this goal has been obtained.

You have a major decision in this State, obviously, because you have invited them to your conference: what are the best actions to take with proprietary institutions? There is a growing movement in the country, and in a number of states, to provide assistance to students attending such institutions. Some states have gone the route of simply designating a special type of award--calling it either vocational, technical or specialized grants. Others have simply added them to the eligible list of institutions for need-based aid programs. Some of these cannot be done instantly for budgetary or other reasons.

You will get in Florida an increase in the number of half-time students. You have to deal with that as a real issue. Of the 90,000 state-aided students found in Illinois, over 10,000 of them attend half-time. This past year alone in our state, where overall we had about three precent less students, we had eighteen percent increase in the number of half-time students. More students seek a combination of job and school as the path they want to take.

They are trying to best decide what it is that they want to obtain in either the income or the career that relates to their education. So, half-time students, not only today, but as I see it, in the future will become more of a reality in every state as students elect the kind of experience they want.

There is no question, in my observation, that if you want to create reasonable choice and to operate in a maximum way both for the student and the institution, you will try to figure out both administratively and otherwise, how the announcement to the student can reach them at dates and times which will truly permit them to make that choice. I realize that maybe because of the size of the program, or the cost of funds available to the employer, that you postpone your announcements until June, July or August. I can only assure you that as you do this, "X" amount of students that might have wanted to attend state institutions commit themselves to schools in other states. If you wish to make access equally important to reasonable choice, you will have your funds early and thus the ability to have longer periods of application. In a state like Illinois, my applications go out in September or October of the fall before the school year starts, and I am still processing applications a year from the February that follows the half-way point of the academic year. This happened because by public policy our master planners say that the student who is still deciding as late as August or September for the first term should be able to apply.

I have presented all of these things realizing that it will take

funds and it will take time. However, it gives you a panorama of all the kinds of decisions you will make over time. You should try to balance how these public funds can best be used. You have already talked about the need to think about need both in absolute and relative terms. Obviously, I feel that relative needs serve to reinforce, very significantly, the purpose of reasonable choice. Absolute needs tend to work the other way with low-income families receiving help. But again, study the impact of the title and schedule under basic grants and you will see that the number of those families who earn $26,000 or less who previously received nothing from basic grants has significantly increased. The country, as you know, has added over a billion dollars in that program, and I would think that at least four percent of that amount is going to come Florida's way that was not there last year.

Your program planners wanted me to talk about accountability and what's ahead in terms of the state investment and what role they should play in terms of the institutions who are participants. Obviously, I think you have to have the funds and the expectancy to perform audits by institutions in terms of eligibility of funds. Audits that may go so far as to determine whether or not the packaging of the aid is within the guidelines the state has established. Nothing will hurt the field of student financial aid more than if a few schools decide that they will "buy" students with federal or state dollars and will simply play the game a little different than others. The state has to be very concerned that a student's legitimate need is being met, and not overmet.

I think too, you must work out and have in order a variety of understandings in terms of refund policies that are implemented by state authorities and represent a protection for the student and the way the school operates. It must show that a fair amount was claimed for the amount of service rendered. Related to that, although we all employ in this room a certain amount of creativity in the offering of collegiate credit, let me alert you that any creativity that begins to bring credit to students for graduation and that has little institutional costs beyond one or two clerks simply writing something on a transcript, does not deserve the support of the taxpayers. I think that in our desire to look creatively at what should be given credit, we have to be aware that a great amount of state money will go out when little teaching resources or material resources were needed to deliver that credit. I think too, you need to be very sensitive to let each school work out and then put on public record what represents academic progress.

Mr. Chairman, I will be glad later to take questions too, but I am glad to share these overviews. Be concerned that freedom of choice means freedom to attend public as well as private institutions. And be concerned that every decision you make will not be in perfect balance to give a priority to reasonable choice or access. Whatever you decide, try to balance both of those goals over time.

Thank you.

Case Study: California

by

Morgan Odell
Executive Director
California Association of Independent Colleges
and Universities

A harmonious relationship between the independent and state supported sectors of higher education exists in many states. In few states is this relationship as unharmonious as it is in Florida.

A major factor in the development of higher education in California has been the competition and cooperation between the two sectors.

The rivalry between Berkeley and Stanford assisted both institutions to move to the highest levels of academic quality. When new campuses of the University of California were added, the highly academic program was maintained. This allowed room for the State University and the community colleges to achieve excellence in their educational missions. And, of course, the quality of the state supported institutions, available to students at low or no tuition, means that independent colleges must be good in order to survive and succeed.

Cooperation between the two sectors exists in many forms in California. It is very important at the political level, where

the state universities and independent institutions frequently join forces to support or oppose legislation. Last year, action by independent segment representatives was instrumental in eliminating budget language that would have put serious restrictions on the University of California in several areas of administration. Independent university presidents have publicly criticized as inadequate budget recommendations for state universities made by California's two most recent governors. David Saxon, the president of the University of California, would oppose any legislation that threatened to control the educational operations of independent colleges. And he has consistently given support to bills whose purpose is to strengthen the state student assistance programs, financial aid that goes to students in all segments but in much larger amounts to students at independent institutions. David Saxon and other leaders of state-supported universities see that a strong independent sector is essential to the quality and freedom of all of higher education. I believe that by working together the two sectors can obtain more funds for higher education than they can by fighting each other or by pursuing only their own direct interests. The pie isn't of fixed size. Each has its own group of trustees, alumni, and friends to render assistance. It doesn't make any sense to fight publicly. Resolve differences behind closed doors. Then go to the governor and legislature with a package both sectors can support. Then bring on the constituents.

What steps might be taken to promote harmony between the independent and state supported sectors in Florida? Here are some suggestions:

1) Less talk about segmental interests, more talk about student interests. The recent expansion of the federal student assistance programs makes it possible for a state like Florida to provide full access for Florida college students--that is, to make it economically possible for students to attend any institution in the state they are qualified to attend. With the expansion of the Federal BEOG program and the distribution of institutions throughout the state, Florida is moving closer to the goal of full access. I suspect that only a fairly modest strengthening of state grants, to supplement federal student assistance, is needed to achieve that goal for virtually all Florida students.

2) Stop talking about "saving the private sector" because to some persons that may sound like every last independent institution should survive, no matter how poor a job it is doing in educating students. I believe the public interest is best served, not by a policy that assures the survival of poor institutions, nor by one that allows good colleges to be lost, but by one that permits the poor to fail and the good to succeed. In most states, state student assistance programs can serve as the major instrument for implementing such a policy.

3) Send to the junk yard the myth that any state funds

that go to students in independent institutions come out of the hides of state supported universities. On the contrary, the state subsidies in the form of grants that students accept to attend independent institutions are substantially smaller than the state subsidies these students would receive if they enrolled in state universities. This is because a large percentage of the cost of educating a student in an independent college is met by funds from private sources while a student in a state university is supported mainly by tax dollars. If you believe in the fixed pie theory this means that state universities are better off by having independent colleges maintain their share of enrollment. Why? Because if state institutions had to accomodate a substantial shift of students from independent institutions while the state provided no additional funds for higher education, state universities would receive fewer state tax dollars for each student. If you believe in the flexible pie then the existence of a healthy independent sector benefits state universities as above and also by an expansion of the pie that the combined efforts of the two sectors may help bring about.

4) A second myth of dispel is the idea that a college must have a low tuition charge in order to provide access. It is difficult to understand how any person with even casual knowledge of college enrollment patterns could make such an assertion. First of all, removing the tuition barrier isn't enough for the lowest income students. They usually need student aid

funds to help cover room and board charges as well. Secondly, the large numbers of low income students in high tuition independent institutions around the country show that tuition doesn't impede access for such students. To illustrate the point, parental income of entering freshmen at the University of Southern California, with tuition of over $4000 a year, averages several thousand dollars less than parental income of freshmen students entering UCLA, with tuition of around $600. Student assistance programs are, of course, the answer.

5) Re-examine the goals of higher education in Florida in light of new conditions and circumstances. For example, how might state student assistance programs be changed to realize more fully the goal of access for all qualified students?

Efficient use of taxpayer funds is moving up the scale of higher educational goals. What policies might permit the state to make greater use of the resources of the independent sector and thus get more mileage out of tax dollars?

Quality of education certainly is another goal. How do independent institutions enhance quality? What new state policies might allow them to make a greater contribution?

An extensive study of independent colleges and universities was completed by the California Postsecondary Commission earlier this year.

Among its findings and recommendations were the following:

A. The existence of a healthy independent sector is necessary for the achievement of several important State goals in California postsecondary education.

These goals are:

*to provide students the greatest possible opportunity to attend a postsecondary institution which most closely meets their perceived educational goals;

*to encourage and maintain independent governance of a major segment of California postsecondary education;

*to encourage diversity and constructive competition between the independent and public sectors, thereby providing a stimulus for innovation and positive change in all of postsecondary education;

*to encourage the most effective utilization of the State's postsecondary resources:

*to promote and maintain a diverse range of postsecondary alternatives for students in California;

*to provide, to a reasonable degree, financial assistance to individuals with demonstrated financial need who desire to enroll in an independent college and university;

*to promote access to postsecondary education for all persons in California regardless of income, race, ethnicity, age, sex, physical disabilities, or geographies; and

*to promote high-quality learning environments for students in postsecondary education.

B. Existing State policy to provide assistance to qualified students with financial need who desire to enroll in an independent institution should be continued, and should be coordinated with changes in federal student-assistance programs. These programs are desirable and should be maintained in a way that will (1) give students the opportunity to attend the postsecondary institution which most closely meets their educational needs (2) give independent institutions a reasonable and fair opportunity to compete with public institutions in the recruitment and education of students, and (3) encourage constructive competition between public and independent institutions to promote high-quality and diversified educational opportunities.

6) Harmony between the sectors also will be promoted if there is appropriate participation of independent institutions in state level decision-making that affects all of higher education or independent higher education alone. Is there a proper balance between sectors in the makeup of the Florida Postsecondary Education Commission? Does the independent sector have a full opportunity to present ideas and opinions in the deliberations of the advisory and technical committees that assist the commission?

The Statutory Advisory Committee of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is so named because its existence is established in legislation. It is made up of the heads of the three state supported segments--University of California, State University and Colleges, and Community Colleges--plus the Superintendent of Public Instruction and leaders from the independent and proprietary sectors. These persons or their designees meet with the Commission director in advance of every meeting of the Commission. They review each agenda item, help plan future work, and are kept up to date on all important Commission matters. This has worked very well. The independent sector in California is well informed and has been involved in everything it wanted to be a part of. Last year I served as the Chairman of the Statutory Advisory Committee.

Less concern for uniformity and control and more concern

for diversity and institutional autonomy may be indicated. The independence of independent institutions means a relative degree of freedom in decision-making and a high degree of self-reliance in matching income to expenditures and visa versa. These are qualities that make independent institutions valuable to society, including students and taxpayers. These institutions function best when state officials resist their own impulse to pull the independents more into the system in order to make things neat and orderly. Perhaps a little more independence would help state supported institutions as well.

Your state has a unique opportunity to shape the development of higher education during the coming decades. Yours is one of a handful of states where the college age population may continue to grow. You are more sun belt than anybody. Your state legislators have urged, indeed insisted, that you get on with the task. Consider again what harmony between the sectors could bring. Give it a try.

SECTION III

"Policy Issues, The Federal Government, and Diversity"

by

John D. Phillips
President
National Association of Independent Colleges
and Universities

Listening to that gracious introduction, I'm somehow reminded of Winston Churchill's comment to Harry Truman about Clement Attlee, which was: "There's a lot less there than meets the eye." To which Truman responded by observing that Attlee seemed "a decent and humble fellow," and Churchill shot back: "That's because he has so much to be humble about."

One of the biggest and most important things I have to be humble about is the opportunity to reflect and represent the enormous diversity of institutions, such as the members of the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida, at the crossroads of our national political life -- that weird and wonderful world of the knave as well as the brave which we fondly refer to as "Disneyland on the Potomac."

Finding common threads among such diverse institutions as Flagler College, Jacksonville University, Biscayne College, University of Miami, and Embry-Riddle University is no mean task. And finding commonalities among such diverse leaders

as Bill Proctor, Bob Spiro, John Farrell, Henry King Stanford, and Jack Hunt -- not to mention my good friend George Russell -- is an even meaner task. But recent experience within both ICUF and NAICU suggests that independent higher education gradually is pulling together into one unified voice -- at both the state and federal levels -- and conferences such as this one suggest that our voice is beginning to be heard and listened to by others who are concerned and committed to the welfare of higher education -- public sector leaders, state agency leaders, private citizens who serve as trustees and regents, and (most important) legislators at both the state and federal levels. But more about that a little latter on. My first task is to describe the federal policy perspective, and that requires a bit of recent history.

Washington really has become a strange and almost otherworldly place -- most vividly and accurately protrayed in October of an election year, when every nerve is drawn taut and every bill faces instant success or extinction in the frantic rush to adjournment. And this year, if it hadn't been such a deadly serious business, with so much at stake for higher education, it might almost have been regarded as comical.

By early October, all the speeches and the press releases had been delivered, and the postured presentations to the television cameras, the radio microphones, and the newspaper reporters had evaporated. And we were left with strange, almost eerie scenes, in which the high and the mighty took off their

coats and their television make-up to meet together in conference committees which often ran deep into the night and early morning hours, and left their members looking and acting a lot like college students who has stayed up all night cramming for a final exam or driving themselves to finish a term paper.

Sometimes it is comical, sometimes it is touching, but always it is human. Often times a United States Senator will stumble on a parliamentary point, or forget whether a motion is in order, or even which motion is before the conference committee -- displaying the same human failings as we do in our student governments, our faculty senates, and our boards of trustees meetings.

Sometimes emotions run high, and sometimes you could almost light a match with the sparks of anger and frustration in the air. Yet nearly always, somehow, a compromise is reached, a bargain is struck, and one by one the Senators and Congressmen come around to the end of the table to sign the conference report.

In those critical moments, you might say that they are driven back upon themselves, on their basic intellectual faculties, on their basic moral and educational heritage, and on their fundamental commitment to make the process of representative government work, to make our system succeed where so many others have failed. And you also might point out that they didn't just wake up one morning and decide to honor that heritage -- it had to be learned and understood and accepted

before it could be honored. They had to learn "to show respect for the democratic heritage, by regard for the rights and opinions of others, by maintaining a rational community that encourages self-discipline, and by concern for the dignity of the individual."

That quotation comes not from the Magna Charta, the Declaration of Independence, or the Constitution, but rather from the statement of aims for a Florida independent college, and I suspect none in this audience will be surprised if I suggest that independent colleges -- in Florida and throughout America -- are among the best places to learn our basic moral and educational heritage as a nation -- indeed, to suggest that they are among the principal guardians of that heritage.

But I guess we all know that, or at least have a clear sense of it, or we wouldn't be gathered together to cope and grope with the question of state policies to nourish independent higher education. The problem is to get those who are not here this morning to know what independent colleges are all about, to get them clearly to recognize the enormous contributions which these colleges make to our state and national life, and to get them to help create an environment of public policies which nourishes such colleges.

Part of our job is being done for us by the current generation of college students, who, with the help of their families and the benefits of various federal and state student aid programs, are successfully conspiring to pay the price of enrolling at independent colleges, and doing so in sustaining numbers.

They have to pay a lot more than they would at state institutions, but they apparently believe it's worth a lot more.

They are supported in that belief by a sizable and growing school of educational researchers who identify the search for individual identity, rather than economic survival, as the wave of the future, and whose research data demonstrates everyday more clearly and convincingly that small church-related colleges provide far and away the best places for students to pursue that search for individual identity.

Unfortunately, however, such research findings don't seem to command banner headlines in The Washington Post, or even The Orlando Sentinel. Their interest is dominated instead by such matters as inflation, unemployment, interest rates, taxes, government spending, and the decline of the dollar -- reminding everybody every day that we do indeed live in the age of the economist. This perspective has gotten so far out of control that John Kenneth Galbraith has jokingly suggested that when an American of this generation dies and ascends heaven-ward, St. Peter will quickly brush aside such matters as repentence and good works and absolution, and ask the one really important question, which is: "What did you do for the gross national product?"

Those who are victimized by this gross national perspective tend to assess the value of a college education not in terms of serving individual identity, but rather in terms of its value to raise individual earning power in the economic marketplace.

Completely ignoring the plain fact that today's college graduates must be prepared to adapt themselves to an average of at least three different career avenues during their working lifetimes -- each involving its own specialized knowledge -- these commentators would squeeze the mental and moral life out of the college educational experience, and reduce it all down to the simple cost-benefit issue of whether or not a sociology major can secure redeeming social value in the eyes of the economist by securing employment as a sociologist!

This question is not, of course, irrelevant. Unemployed sociologist have just as much trouble meeting their car payments as unemployed day laborers, and we must be mindful of the imperative to make education relevant to employment opportunities, as Barry College has with its social work program, and the University of Miami in a number of fields. Our problem is to make certain this does not become the only question asked in assessing the value of higher education, and the question of a college's value in sustaining the nation's basic moral and educational heritage remains consistently relevant to the consideration of taxpayer support for higher education. Containing and offsetting the insistent pressures of economic input/output analysis is a continuing battle which must be fought and won over and over again if we are to succeed in building a public policy environment which sustains and nourishes independent colleges and universities.

Another battle which we simply have to win, over and over again, is the fight to stem the tide of overwhelming government

regulation that threatens to engulf all of higher education and destroy its basic freedom and independence from political controls. Hardly a day passes in Washington, D.C., without the issuance of some new federal regulation telling us what we must do and how we must do it if we are to comply with various federal laws and maintain the eligibility of our students and our educational programs to receive federal support. And it's often very hard to fight these unwarranted intrusions of government into our colleges without at the same time giving the appearance of fighting against the proper implementation of federal social legislation.

Here again, it seems to me that we all are suffering from a potentially tragic narrowness of perspective. In our zeal to set everything right, and to pass national legislation reaching into practically every corner of human endeavor, we now have created something like 450 separate federal laws which affect higher educaion in ways large and small, and legions of federal workers who are hired and fired, paid and promoted, for the express purpose of bring (some would say "whipping") higher educational institutions into line with those 450 different federal laws and the various judicial rulings they have inspired.

But the basic presumption here -- that people can't or won't do what's right unless government forces them to do it -- carries within it potentially tragic consequences for that basic moral and educational heritage I mentioned earlier in these remarks, in the sense that it discourages and undermines our national

heritage of self-discipline, of self-control, of self-regulation. Indeed, it threatens the fundamental ideal of self-government in our states and in our higher educational institutions.

Nobody can visit this state or attend this conference without being impressed with the vitality and the responsiveness of Florida's system of self-governance in higher education. It may take a 60-page handbook to describe all of the existing relationships, and months of familiarization to discover how the system really works. But so what? The papers, and speeches, and discussions at this conference clearly bespeak the emergence of a proven and reliable tradition of self-governance to solve problems in an open and cooperative fashion at the state and community levels.

Yet if the visitor to a Florida higher educational institution -- be it public or independent -- happens to be a compliance officer from USOE, or OCR, or DOL, or IRS, the whole spirit and presumption of the laws that he or she is paid to enforce might well prompt that officer to ignore this clear evidence of healthy and responsive self-governance, and demand a frightening array of corroborating facts and figures, data runs and quadruplicate reports to satisfy the detailed regulations he or she is paid to enforce.

The fundamental and growing problem here is one of simply human trust. Instead of a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people," we increasingly find ourselves beset and beleaguered by a government which seems distant, almost alienated from the people, and relationships between the government and the people which increasingly are characterized by feelings of mistrust,

suspicion, or just plain dread. Historian Richard Hofstadter once remarked that the Founding Fathers had erected "a harmonious system of mutual frustration" for the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of our federal government. Today it might be suggested that the frustration is rampant and the harmony is gone. The predictable result of these feelings is a growing reluctance of citizen taxpayers to accept the government and to support it. Indeed, it could even be suggested that the current evidence of a mounting taxpayers' revolt is nothing more or less than the current expression of a very old and very important American credo -- "No taxation without representation."

The great danger is that, as state governments turn their attention to higher education, and to accommodations between the public and independent sectors within higher education, they will repeat the errors of the federal government and compound rather than relieve the problem of government control. I don't know whether it is still true that there are more employees in the U.S. Department of Agriculture than there are farmers in America, and I don't know the situation here in Florida. But in many states the unelected bureaucracies -- in central higher education administrations, in state educational agencies, in executive department staffs, and even in legislative staffs -- have mushroomed to the point that there seem to be more people regulating than being regulated, and less and less evidence of responsive, representative government actually at work and actually solving problems.

My own view is that, whether or not they intended it, the

leaders of the higher education committees in the Congress have marked out a fairly clear trail to the solution of this fundamental dilemma in the higher education laws enacted in 1972, 1976, and a few weeks ago.

The obvious and most widely-heralded policy theme of these enactments has been the enormous reorientation of the federal role in higher education toward primary reliance upon student aid programs, with Basic Grants growing from a $60-million program reaching 150,000 students when I was mismanaging it only six years ago to a $3-billion program reaching 3 million students for the 1979-80 school year. I truly believe that the middle-income student and bill which was enacted in the final hours of the 95th Congress one day will be regarded, in retrospect, as truly "landmark legislation," because it finally established the breadth as well as the depth of student coverage to bring financial accessibility to higher education within the realm of possibility even for those middle-income families who have been most deeply ravaged by inflation and taxes. In that connection, I'm reminded of the New Yorker cartoon showing a six-member family gathered around the kitchen table, listening to the father say: "I've called the family together to announce that, because of inflation, I'm going to have to let two of you go."

But if the dream of financial accessibility for all Americans to all of American higher education, and the realistic economic choice of attending an independent college, is to be realized, the federal legislation must be matched by relentless efforts to expand state programs as you are doing in Florida. And I can only hope

and pray that an accommodation can be reached between the public and independent sectors on the issue of need-based vs. tuition-based student grants before you get too deeply into the next legislative session, lest your effort to build up to a significant level of state student grants be lost in a sea of discussion within the Florida higher education community.

But let's not kid ourselves, and rely either too heavily or too optimistically on state student aid programs, by themselves, really to sustain a continuing balance of enrollments between the public and independent sectors in this or any other state. The truth is that a good deal more will be required to achieve that objective -- and that leads me to mention the second major policy theme of recent Congressional enactments, a theme that is not nearly as well-known or as widely recognized as the student aid theme.

I refer, of course, to the gradual replacement of restricted categorical programs, and all of their nightmarish standards and requirements, with capitation grants to higher educational institutions based on general service standards. The notion of capitation grants for general educational services has been spreading with little notice through a number of federal programs during the last few years, including the allied health professions, law enforcement, and a variety of other occupational education areas. At the same time, several states have adopted programs which make capitation grants available to independent colleges and universities based on the numbers of state residents they enroll in degree credit

courses. Such programs are relatively simple to administer, and they avoid drawing the state into the business of detailed academic program evaluation by relying upon the existing triad of accreditation, state licensing and eligibility to participate in federal student aid programs as the basis for making capitation grants available to independent institutions.

I wouldn't want to insert myself into the work of this conference to the extent of suggesting that the idea of capitation grants is one whose time has come in Florida, but I am somehow reminded of another New Yorker cartoon, this one showing an executive at his desk giving instructions through the intercom: 'Miss Woodlow, bring me a coffee, black, no sugar, a poppy-seed roll, and an idea whose time has come!" Generally speaking, I really do think it is wise and proper for states to look beyond the prevailing and conventional wisdom of student aid strategies, and to explore additional mechanisms for stabilizing the financial and enrollment patterns within their higher educational system -- where "the system" is visualized as a common enterprise embracing both public and independent sectors, dedicated fundamentally to serve our basic moral and educational heritage as a nation, and not just annual sets of productivity curves.

Based on the federal perspective and the federal experience, the basic policy themes to be pursued, whether through student aid or capitation grants, or whatever, should be (1) service to students with funding based on the enrollment of students in a relatively free-choice educational marketplace, (2) judicious intervention in

the marketplace to prevent unfair competition, and duplication of programs, and to assure coordinated responses to new and emerging program needs, and (3) above all, simple, responsive, and representative mechanisms to contain the tendency toward governmental overkill. I'm reminded of what uses to be called the "KISS test" of government programs -- namely, "Keep It Simple, Stupid!" But in addressing this distinguished group of Florida educational leaders, let me revise that and beseech you to "Keep It Simple, Sir!"

Thank you for the opportunity to share these thoughts with you.

SECTION IV

Summary Notes

by

Louis Rabineau
Director, Inservice Education Program
Education Commission of the States

It is a pleasure to be part of this important meeting and to have the Education Commission of the States share in the important proceedings with the Florida Postsecondary Education Commission.

Everyone here should be commended for his or her part in being forthright in expressing feelings about an important topic which has deep concerns in Florida as in many other states. Even just showing up for the exchange is a tribute to each of you and you have done more than show up here.

There are four parts to these remarks. I shall attempt to (1) capture some of the key questions that have been raised, (2) suggest some propositions, (3) review alternate vehicles, (4) make some final observations. You have been treated to excellent background information to help answer these questions. It is obvious this rich meeting does not have as an objective a search for one agenda for action, but that it has sought to do four things:

1. identify the issues
2. find out where you are in Florida -- besides Orlando,

3. consider alternate possibilities,
4. assist the postsecondary education commission to evolve a statement of policy for consideration by the education department and the legislative and executive branches.

To recapture exactly all significant items is difficult but let's try, even though we can't do true justice to each of the excellent presentations. U. S. Senator Elect Boren set an excellent tone by focusing attention on (1) the purpose of education, (2) importance of the dual system of education, and (3) the importance of harmony as the private sector takes a vital part in the dual system of higher education.

What are some causes of the trouble besetting higher education? It would appear that there are six main causes for the trouble besetting private higher education according to Louis Benezet. I would note that some of these causes relate to problems in public higher education as well.

1. Rising cost per student, especially in graduate education;
2. Limits in higher education, public and private, to improve efficiency or to raise productivity despite continued efforts such as in educational technology;
3. The market limit on tuition rises;
4. Inability of voluntary giving to keep up with costs;
5. Growing competition for program offerings and facilities with public institutions;
6. National inflation and its impact on fixed costs such as utilities and repairs.

What are key questions that must be addressed?

1. Why should the state be interested in independent colleges and universities?
2. a. How should independent sector be included in statewide planning?
   b. How should state support the private sector?
      1. Through institutions?
      2. Through students?
3. Accountability
   a. The same as public?
   b. Dependent on amount of aid (see Berdahl)
   c. Limited to programs that are receiving support.
4. Why state support?
   a. Private institutions are a basic part of the American tradition.
   b. They perform a public mission. John Silber in Atlantic Monthly would argue that "there is no such thing as a private college or university."
   c. They offer a wealth of educational (and cultural) options that enrich the range of resources.
   d. Private colleges offer for the benefit of both themselves and of public institutions an alternative to public control of all of higher education. "One of the great virtues of private institutions is that their governance is independent, or private. Private institutions continue to serve a vital role in higher education in this country

. . . a check and balance to a sometimes overwhelming governmental pressure in the governance of public higher education" (financing higher education 1975).

e. Why should the state support private colleges? Some legislators would argue that "The reason is simple: It saves money for the taxpayers. It is cheaper by far for states to provide a margin of help to independent institutions than it would be to take them over, or to pay to have their students educated at state-owned institutions. State legislators . . . can recognize a bargain when they see one." (From Steven Muller -- should states support private colleges.)

Basic Questions from the Public College Student.

There is another point of view. An antagonist to state support of private higher education -- would argue, as Chancellor Priest did in the AGB reports:

1. Need are private colleges and universities in such dire financial straits that they need state tax money in order to survive?
2. Is it appropriate? If such need exists, is it appropriate for the state to respond through appropriation of tax dollars?
3. Impact on Public if the state does support the private sector, what kind of impact will this have on not only the public schools but on private institutions as well?

In regard to this last point, I asked the author of the Bundy

program, who will remain anonymous, how he ever managed to get the then Chancellor of the State University of New York, Samuel Gould, (now a Florida resident) to go along with heavy aid to privates. His response was, I am paraphrasing, "so long as the state university can still be a horse, the State University of New York doesn't resent seing the rabbits fed."

One last point to allay fears of publics: virtually all -- if not all -- States that have increased independent college aid have also increased public support at the same time. One possible exception, according to Breneman, is New York State.

What Are Some Themes That Seemed To Emerge?

While educators are asked -- and it's a tribute to the legislators and agencies that they ask for recommendations, it should be remembered that ultimate decisions on the role of public and private sectors rests with the Legislators and Governor.

1. Why support private sector colleges?

   The State, if it chooses to do so, supports it not because large numbers of institutions are about to go under. While State support of private institutions might well save some from going under, the purpose from the States viewpoint, should not be to save an institution for the institution's sake but rather for the sake of the State. Not all private colleges are high quality and not all public institutions are of inferior quality. Some privates might deserve to

to be sustained for the good of society.

2. Need for State policy

   Florida should construct a specific policy regarding the independent colleges and universities. It should consider State purposes, and the role and condition of the independent institutions.

3. Monitoring

   Programs that benefit higher education should be monitored by the States to provide assessment of the extent to which objectives of such programs are being accomplished.

4. Planning/Participation

   Statewide planning should take into account the independent sector. The independent sector should participate as partners in State planning and coordination.

   If independent institutions are to accept funds there is a price institutions will have to pay -- some of their autonomy will have to answer to those who dole out the dollar.

   What independence should they protect? (see sec. B below) some means of monitoring might include state scrutiny of program development, quantity of programs, and proliferation of campuses.

5. Regarding autonomy and independence - what is it?

   Oxford/Cambridge are among 48 institutions in Great Britian receiving block grants from the National University Grants Committee.

When asked (1966) what the Oxbridge Colleges considered to be the essentials of independence, the paraphrased reply was:

a. The right to admit our own students.

b. Appoint our own faculty.

c. Decide our own courses of study

(Claremont Colleges 1966)

(Query: What about the flexibility or freedom to move funds within the institutions budget?)

6. How much control can be expected

Extent of aid related to amount and type of control.

"The extent of state control should be proportionate to the amount and type of State aid rendered: if such aid is modest and indirect, intervention should be minimal. But if the State grants substantial sums directly to its private institutions, state controls must inevitably be rather elaborate." (Berdahl 1971)

Some Possible Vehicles For Administering State Aid

You heard some samples from Joe Boyd, Morgan Odell and Ed McGuire. "The method of providing (such direct) aid to private institutions, from State to State, should, ... be linked to the performance of specifically identified public missions." (From Chancellor of the State University of New York, Ernest Boyer, now U. S. Commissioner of Education).

Alternatives for Aid

1. Student - Centered

   Emphasis on fair market

2. Institution - Centered

   Emphasis on development of an efficient network of institutional opportunities.

Most States have a mixture of these two elements.

Need-Based Aid Alternatives

The task force on State policy and higher education recommends "that States give first consideration to development of need-based student grant programs, funded at levels adequate to provide students with real choice among institutions."

Alternatives

1. Direct institutional grants to institutions.
2. Tuition equalization grants.
3. Contracts, Florida has dipped its toes in that water with contracts involving nursing and social work.
4. Cost of education grants to institutions.

Types Of State Aid Programs

1. Need-based and limit payments to tuition and required fees - 1/2 of States.
2. Tuition equalization - 1/3 of States.
3. Direct grants to institutions - Alabama, Illinois, and

Maryland, unconstitutional in some States

Some Points Presented By John Folger At A Meeting In The State Of Kentucky

1. States have developed several types of student aid program. About half the states have programs that are need based and limit payments to tuition and required fees. If the maximum award is high enough (1,500 or more) a program like this, adequately funded, will cover a larger part of the tuition gap between public and private institutions. Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and Tennessee are States that have different versions of this approach. Illinois's program is the best funded, they provide an average award to recipients attending private institutions of about 1,300, and their awards are overall about $475 per FTE in private higher education. The other half of the States have a need based program of student aid which provides aid for living expenses as well as tuition.
2. Another approach, which is targeted more directly at the tuition gap is the tuition equalization program which is used in about a third of the States. Over half the tuition equalization program are need based, and this provides the lowest cost way for a state to target assistance on the tuition gap, and increase the options for its residents. Among the SREB and neighboring States, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, North and South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia have tuition equalization programs, and Indiana has a

similar program linked to its tuition grant program. South Carolina which provides an award that averages almost $400 per private college student, is the best funded. Brief descriptions of the various programs of aid that assist the private sector can be found in the ECS publication, Higher Education in the States, 1978, Vol. 7, No. 1.

3. Another approach is providing direct grants to institutions, rather than to students. As a policy option, most southern States have rejected the direct aid approach. However, Alabama, Illinois, and Maryland make direct grants to private institutions, although Illinois provides most of its money to the private sector through student aid. Direct aid is unconstitutional in some states, and usually makes the independent institutions subject to similar accountability requirements that public institutions must meet.

Some Strawman Questions:

1. Will the support of private institutions result in a planned economy and thereby sacrifice open competition? It has never been either. It has been a mix and will continue so. One might even argue that support of a sector (private) enhances its chance to compete.
2. Should private institutions worry about being accountable? Institutions have always been accountable for funds. (Private colleges have been accountable to their boards, and more

subtly sometimes, to alumni.)

3. Should one fear state planning in postsecondary education, will it stifle diversity? Free market without state intervention won't always guarantee or enhance diversity.
   a. In a totally free academic market, the temptation could be for institutions to imitate each other.
   b. Much of the diversity as represented by the development of community colleges in Florida, and the great public, universities and state colleges, came about not by free market but by State planning.

A Caveat

Florida must put its act together. The public and independent sectors have been given an excellent opportunity to contribute to state policy. Yesterday's discussion brought out at least two points:

1. If the education community can't come up with answers, others will.
2. Public haranguing won't help for the long haul, intelligent discussion without grabbing headlines just might help.

Florida Structure

If one thinks, at times, it's difficult to get things done consider the plight of other states that do not have at the apex of board structure, the political clout that you have here. If you are determined to implement significant changes, I am con-

vinced that you have structures that can do the job.

Is seeking a compromise between public and private, someting new? If the prophet's suggestion, "let us reason together" is too old hat, then how about what Edmund Burke said, "all government, indeed every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue, and every prudent act, is founded on compromise and barter." That, I submit, is what this conference is about.

No one person can capture all of the nuggets dropped in Orlando in this richly packed 24 hour session. But you can be confident that you can leave here with a renewed interest (maybe commitment?) to work together.

WHO?

1. All of the groups public and private -- with a vested interest in postsecondary education:
2. The various State agencies concerned -- our 1202 Commission The State Department of Education, The University System, and Community Colleges.
3. Legislature, Governor and their staffs.
4. Other interested parties.

This conference should convince you that in Florida you can achieve a meaningful program, making use of your institutions, to the benefit of all the people.

APPENDIX A

THE CONFERENCE PROGRAM

State Policy and Postsecondary Education:
The Relationship of the Independent and Public Sectors

Sponsors: Florida Postsecondary Education Commission
Education Commission of the States

November 30 - December 1, 1978
Orlando Hyatt House
Orlando, Florida

PURPOSE

The purpose of the conference is to provide a background relating to the problems and issues involved in formulating state policy with respect to postsecondary education. The conference will (1) review actions taken elsewhere in the nation; (2) assess the present and prospective status of the postsecondary education sector in Florida; (3) consider possible components to be included in any statement of policy; and (4) assess the legal and fiscal realities implicit in the adoption of such a statement. The Postsecondary Education Commission seeks this information in furtherance of its obligations to consider formulating recommendations to the Commissioner of Education concerning the relationships between the several groups which function in both the public and independent sectors of postsecondary education.

PROGRAM

Thursday, November 30

9:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.		Registration
1:00 p.m. - 1:10 p.m.	I.	Presiding and Welcome - The Honorable D. Burke Kibler, III Chairman, Florida Postsecondary Education Commission
1:10 p.m. - 1:50 p.m.	II.	The Issues - The Honorable David L. Boren, Governor of Oklahoma
1:50 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.	III.	Policy as Implemented Through State Programs - Richard Jonsen, Senior Staff Associate, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
2:30 p.m. - 2:45 p.m.	IV.	Coffee Break
2:45 p.m. - 4:15 p.m.	V.	Postsecondary Education in Florida: Past, Present and Future -

Presiding: Frederick H. Schultz, former Speaker of the House

a. The State University System: Roy McTarnaghan, Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs, State University System of Florida
b. The Community College System: Lee Henderson, Director, Division of Community Colleges, Florida Department of Education
c. The Independent Sector: William Proctor, President Flager College
d. The Proprietary Sector: Mark Wheeler, President, Florida Association of Private Schools

Each presentation should be from 10 - 12 minutes, to be followed by questions from members of the panel or from the audience.

4:15 p.m. - 5:30 p.m. VI. The View from the Top: Policy, Politics and Finance -

Presiding: Robert T. Mann, Member Florida Public Service Commission

Panelists:
Senator Phil Lewis, President of the State
Representative Hyatt Brown, Speaker of the House
Carl Blackwell, Department of Administration
The Presiding Officer of each House of the Legislature will nominate an additional panel member

6:30 p.m. - 7:15 p.m. VII. Reception -

Host: Florida Association of Private Schools

7:15 p.m. - 9:00 p.m. VIII. Dinner

Presiding: The Honorable Ralph Turlington, Commissioner of Education

Dinner Speaker:
The Honorable D. Robert Graham
Governor-Elect of Florida

9:00 p.m. - 10:00 p.m.	IX.	Informal Round Table Discussion Groups
Friday, December 1		
8:45 a.m. - 10:15 a.m.	X.	Programs in Selected States: Content, Cost Accountability, Pros and Cons - Presiding: Terrell Sessums, Former Speaker of the House Panelists: Pennsylvania - Edward McGuire, Chancellor, Massachusetts Board of Higher Education (former Pennsylvania Commissioner of Higher Education) Illinois - Joseph D. Boyd, Executive Director, Illinois State Scholarship Commission California - Morgan Odell, Executive Director, Association of Independent Colleges and Universities
10:15 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.	XI.	Coffee Break
10:30 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.	XII.	Policy Issues, The Federal Government and Diversity - John Phillips, President, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities
11:00 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.	XIII.	State Policy and the Future - Roger Nichols, Deputy Commissioner, Florida Department of Education
11:30 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.	XIV.	Summary - Louis Rabineau, Project Director, Inservice Educational Project, Education Commission of the States

APPENDIX B

MEMBERSHIP:
POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

FLORIDA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

MEMBERSHIP CATEGORIES

Category	Name	Telephone Number	Term Expires
Public Universities	Dr. Robert Mautz Regents Professor 182 Grinter Hall University of Florida Gainesville 32611	904/392-2471	September 30, 1981
	Dr. Andrew A. Robinson Dean, College of Education University of North Florida Jacksonville 32216	904/646-2666	September 30, 1980
	The Honorable Betty Anne Staton Member, Florida Board of Regents 1217 Reading Drive Orlando 32804	305/422-4196	September 30, 1979
Public Community Colleges	Dr. Ezekiel W. Bryant Provost, North Campus Florida Junior College at Jacksonville Jacksonville 32218	904/757-6251	September 30, 1981
	Dr. Peter Masiko, Jr. President Miami-Dade Community College South Campus Miami 33176	305/596-1211	September 30, 1979
Public Vocational/ Technical	Mrs. Helen Leslie President-Owner K&W Supply House, Inc. P.O. Box 13221 St. Petersburg 33733	813/896-2616	September 30, 1979
Proprietary Schools	Mrs. Delores C. Jones President, East Coast College 1914 Beachway Road, Suite 2-D Jacksonville 32207	904/396-1125 904/358-1876 904/366-1014	September 30, 1981
Independent Colleges and Universities	Dr. Sidney L. Besvinick Associate Provost of Academic Administration and Planning University of Miami P.O. Box 8033 Coral Gables 33124	305/284-3356	September 30, 1980

Florida Postsecondary Education Commission
Membership Categories
Page Two

Category	Name	Telephone Number	Term Expires
Public at Large	The Honorable Elaine Bloom 20435 N.E. 20th Court North Miami Beach 33131	305/932-3335	September 30, 1980
	Mr. Richard Johnston 440 First Avenue, Suite 800 St. Petersburg 33733	813/822-4021	September 30, 1980
	Mr. D. Burke Kibler, III P.O. Box 1772 Lakeland 33802	813/682-1161	September 30, 1981
	Dr. Harry Nyquist Principal Rockledge High School 220 Raider Road Rockledge 32955	305/636-3711	September 30, 1979

APPENDIX C

THE CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

A. Hugh Adams
President
Broward Community College
225 East Las Olas Boulevard
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301
305/467-6700 ext. 203

Weston H. Agor
Chairperson
Department of Politics
and Public Affairs
University of Miami
Box 248047
Coral Gables, Florida 33124
305/284-2401

Rose Allegato
Reporter
Miami Herald
1 Herald Plaza
Miami, Florida 33101
305/350-2012

Richard C. Alterman
Research Associate
Office of Educational Planning,
Budgeting and Evaluation
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-1812

Peter H. Armacost
President
Eckerd College
P.O. Box 12560
5401 - 34th Street South
St. Petersburg, Florida 33733
813/867-1166

Delores A. Auzenne
Special Assistant to
the Chancellor
Board of Regents
107 W. Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-0936

Richard D. Batchelder
Vice President for Affiliate Relations
Florida Education Association/United
200 West Pensacola Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/224-1161

Emilio Begue
Chairman of the Board
Tampa Technical Institute
1005 E. Jackson Street
Tampa, Florida 33602
813/223-1637

Sidney Besvinick
Associate Provost
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida 33124
305/284-3356

Carl Blackwell
Assistant State Budget Director
Department of Administration
530 Carlton Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-8443

Elaine Bloom
Member, Florida Postsecondary
Education Commission
20435 N.E. 20th Court
North Miami Beach, Florida 33179
305/932-3335

Shelley Boone
Deputy Commissioner for
Special Programs
Department of Education
08 Plaza - Capitol Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-9513

George Borders
President
Palm Beach Atlantic College
1101 South Olive Avenue
West Palm Beach, Florida 33401
305/833-8592

David L. Boren
Governor
State of Oklahoma
Office of the Governor
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105
405/521-2342

Kym A. Bowman
Administrative Secretary
Betz Business College
1700 N. Westshore Blvd.
Tampa, Florida 33607
813/876-1336

Joseph D. Boyd
Executive Director
Illinois State Scholarship Commission
102 Wilmot Road
Deerfield, Illinois 60015
312/948-8500

James K. Brodie
Administrator
American Medical Training Institute
10700 Caribbean Blvd.
Miami, Florida 33189
305/253-8028

Oswald P. Bronson
President
Bethune-Cookman College
640 Second Avenue
Daytona Beach, Florida 32015
904/252-8667

J. Hyatt Brown
Representative, 31st District
P.O. Drawer 1230
126 Volusia Avenue
Daytona Beach, Florida 32015
904/252-1973

Ezekiel W. Bryant
Provost, North Campus
Florida Junior College at Jacksonville, North Campus
4501 Capper Road
Jacksonville, Florida 32218
904/757-6251

William C. Bungert
Dean of the College
Lake-Sumter Community College
Leesburg, Florida 32748
904/787-3747

Beverly Burnsed
Member, Florida House of Representatives
P.O. Box 1626
Lakeland, Florida 33802
813/687-4666

Joan E. Bush
Executive Director
Betz Business College
1700 N. Westshore Blvd.
Tampa, Florida 33607
813/876-1336

Tony Carvalho
Legislative Analyst
The Florida Legislature
Room 220, Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-6204

Margarita T. Castellon
Cabinet Aide to the State Treasurer
State Treasurer's Office
The Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-6392

Martha J. Chang
Educational Social Researcher
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/487-1630

Richard D. Cheshire
President
University of Tampa
401 West Kennedy Boulevard
Tampa, Florida 33606
813/253-8861 ext. 345

Joseph Chulak
United Faculty of Florida
200 East College
Tallahassee, Florida
904/224-8220

Edward L. Cisek
Fiscal Analyst
Florida Senate Appropriations Committee
426 Senate Office Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-5636

Janet Clarke
Education Commission of the States
Inservice Education Program
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295
303/861-4917

Lynn B. Clarke
Director of Governmental Relations
University of Miami
P.O. Box 248073
Coral Gables, Florida 33124
305/284-3114

Jules Clavan
Respiratory Therapy Institute, Inc.
2697 Biscayne Blvd.
Miami, Florida 33137
305/573-0260

Trevor Colbourn
President
Florida Technological University
P.O. Box 25000
Orlando, Florida 32816
305/275-2551

William M. Corley, Jr.
Fiscal Analyst
Senate Appropriations Committee
426 Senate Office Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-5636

William R. Cotton
Chairman, State Community College Council
St. Johns River Community College
5001 St. Johns Avenue
Palatka, Florida 32077
904/328-1571

Ron Cunningham
Reporter
Gainesville Sun
P.O. Drawer A
Gainesville, Florida 32601
904/377-9697

Timothy H. Czerniec
Vice-President for Business Affairs
Barry College
11300 N.E. 2nd Avenue
Miami, Florida 33161
305/758-3392

Debbie Davis
Secretary
Office of Educational Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-1812

Helen Gordon Davis
Member, Florida House of Representatives
732 Freedom Federal Building
Tampa, Florida 33602
813/224-0770

Robert A. Davis
President
Florida Southern College
Lakeland, Florida 33802
813/683/5521

L. Nelson Donnell
Dean Educational Planning
Brevard Community College
1519 Clearlake Road
Cocoa, Florida 32922
305/632-1111

Pope A. Duncan
President
Stetson University
Woodland Boulevard
DeLand, Florida 32720
904/734-4121 ext. 354

Frances Y. Dunham
Chairman, Psychology Department
University of West Florida
Pensacola, Florida 32504
904/476-9500 ext. 468

Earl R. Edwards
Executive Director
Special Programs
Department of Education
319 W. Madison Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-9504

Ed Eissey
President
Palm Beach Junior College
4200 Congress Avenue
West Palm Beach, Florida 33401
305/965-8000

Roger Ellison
Executive Vice-President
Trinity Baptist College
426 South McDuff
Jacksonville, Florida 32205
904/384-2206

Al Erxleben
Coordinator
Public Information
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-0082

David L. Evans
Provost - East Campus
Valencia Community College
701 North Econlockhatchee Trail
Orlando, Florida 32807
305/299-5000 ext. 7251

John J. Farrell
President
Biscayne College
16400 N.W. 32nd Avenue
Miami, Florida 33054
305/625-6000

Alan G. Fickett
Special Assistant to the
President, Legislative Liaison
Florida Technological University
P.O. Box 25000
Orlando, Florida 32816
305/275-2671

Abraham S. Fischler
President
Nova University
3301 College Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33314
305/587-6660

M. Trinita Flood
President
Barry College
11300 N.E. 2nd Avenue
Miami, Florida 33161
305/758-3392

Susan Fowler
Administrative Assistant
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/487-1511

C. Wayne Freeberg
Executive Director
State Board of Independent Colleges
and Universities
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-8695

Thomas E. Furlong, Jr.
Associate for Program Policy Analysis
Office of Educational Planning,
Budgeting and Evaluation
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
488-1812/1619

Carolyn S. Garwood
Associate Dean for Instruction
School of Education and Allied
Professions
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida 33124
305/284-3711

Anne Jackaway Gerstein
Director of Admissions
Bauder Fashion College
100 S.E. 4th Street
Miami, Florida 33131
305/371-1508

Gerald B. Gill
Director, Florida Region
Troy State University
P.O. Box 1791
Eglin AFB, Florida 32542
904/882-2624

Roger Gill
Educational Associate
Office of Educational Planning,
Budgeting and Evaluation
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-1812

Philip D. Goldhagen
Director of Special Projects
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-0085

James F. Gollattscheck
President
Valencia Community College
Box 3028
Orlando, Florida 32802
305/299-5000

James E. Goode
Education Services Officer
U.S. Air Force/MacDill AFB
2805 Shelton Avenue
Tampa, Florida 33611
813/830-3118

Seth Gordon
Administrative Assistant
Department of Legal Affairs
Capitol Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-2793

Freddie L. Groomes
Assistant to the President
Florida State University
301 Westcott Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
904/644-5283

Marshall Harris
Director
Florida Education Council
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/487-1630

Jerry N. Harvey
Chairman, District Board of
Trustees
Hillsborough Community College
P.O. Box 22127
Tampa, Florida 33622
813/879-7222

John P. Hasty
President
Central Florida Bible College
2565 East Kaley Avenue
Orlando, Florida 32806
305/898-5908

Lee G. Henderson
Director
Division of Community Colleges
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-1721

Siegfried E. Herrmann
Assistant to the President
for Organizational Development
World University - Systemwide
World University - Miami
121 Majorca Avenue
Coral Gables, Florida 33134
305/446-6289

Joan A. Hill
Coordinator, Academic Programs
State University System
Board of Regents
Department of Education
Tallahasse, Florida 32304
904/488-7702

Fradelle E. Hirsch
Research Associate
Heed University
1720 Harrison Street, 7th Floor
Hollywood, Florida 33021
305/925-1600

Sy Holzman
Executive Assistant to
Secretary of State
Office of the Secretary of State
Lower Level 10, Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-2263

Robert E. Hudson
Chairman, District Board
of Trustees
St. Johns River Community College
5001 St. Johns Avenue
Palatka, Florida 32077
904/328-1571

Libby P. Huggins
Administrative Assistant
Department of Education
Special Program
319 W. Madison Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-9504

W. Richard Johnston
Member, Florida Postsecondary
Education Commission
St. Petersburg Junior College
440 1st Avenue South, Suite 800
St. Petersburg, Florida 33701
813/822-4021

Delores C. Jones
President, East Coast College
1914 Beachway Road, Suite 2D
Jacksonville, Florida 32207
904/396-1125

Elizabeth N. Jones
Trustee
Santa Fe Community College
P.O. Box 1530
Gainesville, Florida 32602
904/377-5161

Jack H. Jones
Chairman, Board of Trustees
Jones College
Arlington Expressway
Jacksonville, Florida 32211
904/743-1122

Milton O. Jones
President
Pasco-Hernando Community College
2401 Highway 41 North
Dade City, Florida 33525
813/567-6701

Vicki Jones
Jones College
Arlington Expressway
Jacksonville, Florida 32211
904/743-1122

Richard W. Jonsen
Senior Staff Association
Western Interstate Commission for
Higher Education
P.O. Drawer P
Boulder, Colorado 80302
303/492-6888

Jerome P. Keuper
President
Florida Institute of Technology
Country Club Road
P.O. Box 1150
Melbourne, Florida 32901
305/723-3701

D. Burke Kibler, III
Chairman, Florida Postsecondary
Education Commission
Department of Education
P.O. Box 1772
Lakeland, Florida 33802
813/682-1161

Ellen Kimmel
Professor, Psychology
University of South Florida
FAO 295 (Campus Mail)
Tampa, Florida 33620
813/974-2100

Maxwell C. King
President
Brevard Community College
1519 Clearlake Road
Cocoa, Florida 32922
305/632-1111 ext. 200

Martin Knobel
Director, National School
of Health Technology
633 N.E. 167 Street, #1024
N. Miami Beach, Florida 33162
305/651-1515

Russell P. Kropp
Professor and Director
of Planning
Florida State University
Stone Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
904/644-3539

Carl M. Kuttler, Jr.
President
St. Petersburg Junior College
P.O. Box 13489
St. Petersburg, Florida 33733
813/546-0011

William D. Law, Jr.
Staff Director
House of Representatives
2271 Hampshire Way
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-3711

Robert O. Lawton
Vice President for
Academic Affairs
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
904/644-1816

H. Douglas Lee
Vice President for Development
Stetson University
Woodland Boulevard
DeLand, Florida 32720
904/734-4121

M.B. Levinson
President
University of Palm Beach
660 Fern Street
West Palm Beach, Florida 33402
305/833-5575

Gerald A. Lewis
Comptroller of Florida
State of Florida
Office of the Comptroller
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-0370

Philip D. Lewis
Member, Florida Senate
608 New Comeau Building
Clematis Street
West Palm Beach, Florida 33401
305/832-3876

A. E. Longfellow
Director of Studies
Saint Paul's Institute of
Biblical Studies
P.O. Drawer 4174
Sarasota, Florida 33578

Patricia Lutterbie
Associate Vice President for
Academic Affairs
Florida International University
Tamiami Campus, PC 529
Miami, Florida 33199
305/552-2151

Robert T. Mann
Commissioner
Public Service Commission
101 East Gaines
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-7001

Robert Q. Marston
President
University of Florida
226 Tigert Hall
Gainesville, Florida 32611
904/392-3261

Peter D. Masiko, Jr.
President
Miami-Dade Community College
11011 S.W. 104 Street
Miami, Florida 33176
305/596-1211

Robert B. Mautz
Member, Florida Postsecondary Education Commission
221 N.W. 12th Terrace
Gainesville, Florida 32601
904/392-2471

J. E. McCracken
President
Okaloosa-Walton Junior College
100 College Boulevard
Niceville, Florida 32578
904/678-5111 ext. 211

Tom McDowell
Manpower Management Planning Specialist
Office of Manpower Planning
2551 Executive Center Circle, West
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
904/487-1165

William C. McGraw, Jr.
Prentice Hall, Inc.
1015 Hunt Avenue
Lakeland, Florida 33801
813/688-9821

Edward C. McGuire
Chancellor
Massachusetts Board of Higher Education
31 Saint James Avenue, Room 632
Boston, Massachusetts 02116
617/727-5360

R. L. McLendon, Jr.
President
St. Johns River Community College
5001 St. Johns Avenue
Palatka, Florida 32077
904/328-1571

Delores B. McMullen
Florida Association of Private Schools
8208 Ridge Bend Court
Tampa, Florida 33615
813/885-3643

Roy E. McTarnaghan
Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs
State University System of Florida
107 W. Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-7702

David C. Montgomery
Director, Planning and Analysis
Florida Board of Regents
107 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-6370

William T. Morris
President
Morris College of Business
Route 1, Box 58
Melbourne, Florida 32935
305/254-6459

L. William Motzel
Vice President, Academics
Embry-Riddle University
Regional Airport
Daytona Beach, Florida 32014
904/252-5561

Fred A. Nelson
Vice President for External Affairs
Nova University
3301 College Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33314
305/587-6660

Roger M. Nichols
Deputy Commissioner of Education
The Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-0816

Harry K. Nyquist
Brevard County Schools
952 Brewster Lane
Rockledge, Florida 32955
305/636-0153

Morgan Odell
Executive Director
Association of Independent
California Colleges and
Universities
37 Brookhollow Drive
Santa Ana, California 92705
714/546-7770

Charles J. O'Malley
Consultant for Non-Public
Schools
Department of Education
Knott Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/487-1640

Murray W. Overstreet, Jr.
Board Chairman
Valencia Community College
P.O. Box 3028
Orlando, Florida 32802
305/299-5000

Paul C. Parker
Associate Vice Chancellor for
Academic Programs
Florida Board of Regents
107 W. Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-7702

Joseph J. Penbera
Assistant to Provost
University of Miami
Ashe 243
Coral Gables, Florida 33124
305/284-5155

David L. Peoples
President
Southeastern Academy, Inc.
2333 East Spacecoast Parkway
Kissimmee, Florida 32741
305/847-4444

Curtis Peterson
Member, Florida Senate
P.O. Box 180
2034 S. Combee Road
Eaton Park, Florida 33840
813/683-9781

John D. Phillips
President
National Association of Independent
Colleges and Universities
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Suite 503
Washington, D. C. 20036
202/387-7623

Stanley Pincus
Respiratory Therapy Institute, Inc.
2697 Biscayne Blvd.
Miami, Florida 33137
305/573-0260

William L. Proctor
President
Flagler College
King Street
St. Augustine, Florida 32084
904/829-6481

Beth Provancha
Orange CTA/FTP-NEA
1625 Hibiscus Avenue
Winter Park, Florida 32789
305/277-5431

Louis Rabineau
Director
Inservice Education Program
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295
303/861-4917

Louis E. Raho
Graduate Student
Florida State University
1112 S. Magnolia Drive T-104
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
904/488-4494

Charles B. Reed
Planning, Budgeting and
Evaluation Director
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-1916

Susan P. Reynolds
Administrative Assistant
Governmental Relations
University of Miami
P.O. Box 248073
Coral Gables, Florida 33124
305/284-3114

Carl D. Riggs
Vice President for
Academic Affairs
University of South Florida
4202 Fowler Avenue
Tampa, Florida 33620
813/974-2154

Martin B. Robbins
President
United Electronics Institute
303 W. Platt Street
Tampa, Florida 33606
813/253-6078

Eugene L. Roberts
President
Lakeland College of
Business and Fashion
2620 Kathleen Road
Lakeland, Florida 33801
813/858-1444

Alan J. Robertson
President
Santa Fe Community College
P.O. Box 1530
Gainesville, Florida 32602
904/377-5161

Piedad F. Robertson
Assistant to the President
Miami-Dade Community College
11011 S.W. 104 Street
Miami, Florida 33176
305/596-1211

Deborah B. Robin
Director, Institute for Lifelong
Awareness
Nova University
3301 College Avenue
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 33314
305/587-6660

Andrew A. Robinson
Dean, College of Education
University of North Florida
St. John's Road South
Post Office Box 17074
Jacksonville, Florida 32216
904/646-2520

David G. Robinson
President
Edison Community College
Ft. Myers, Florida 33901
813/481-2411

Lee F. Rumbley
Cabinet Aide
Florida Department of Agriculture
and Consumer Services
Capitol Building, #1003
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-5676

George P. Russell
Executive Director
Independent Colleges and
Universities of Florida, Inc.
5013 Central Avenue
St. Petersburg, Florida 33710
813/347-5111

David G. Salten
Nova University
41 Park Avenue
New York City, New York 10016
516/686-7670

Patricia L. Schmidt
Chair, Department of
Behavioral Studies
University of Florida
330 Little Hall
Gainesville, Florida 32611
904/392-1551

Frederick H. Schultz
Chairman of the Board, Barnett
Investment Services, Inc.
100 Laura Street
Jacksonville, Florida 32202
904/791-7591

Terrell Sessums
Former Speaker of the
House
100 Madison Street
Tampa, Florida 33602
813/228-7611

Thaddeus Seymour
President
Rollins College
Winter Park, Florida 32789
305/646-2120

Gertrude L. Simmons
Vice President for Academic
Affairs
Florida A & M University
P.O. Box 897
Tallahassee, Florida 32307
904/599-3276

Gary P. Sims
President
North Florida Junior College
Turner Davis Drive
Madison, Florida 32340
904/973-2288 ext. 21

Bernard F. Sliger
President
Florida State University
211 Westcott
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
904/644-1085

David C. Smith
Dean
College of Education
University of Florida
140 Norman Hall
Gainesville, Florida 32611
904/392-0728

Ernest E. Smith, Jr.
Executive Director
Florida Student Financial
Assistance Commission
Knott Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/487-1800

Robert H. Spiro
President
Jacksonville University
University Blvd., North
Jacksonville, Florida 32211
904/744-3950

Betty Anne Staton
Member, Florida Board of Regents
1217 Reading Drive
Orlando, Florida 32804
305/422-4196

Kenneth F. Stone
Owner/Director
Sunstate College of Barber Styling
1650 N. Missouri Avenue
Largo, Florida 33540
813/584-0475

John C. Sutusky
Educational Associate
Office of Educational Planning,
Budgeting and Evaluation
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-1812

H. K. Suzuki
Dean
University of Florida
Box J - 185 J.H.M.H.C.
Gainesville, Florida 32610
904/392-2631

Jack Tebo
Associate for Policy Analysis
Office of Educational Planning,
Budgeting and Evaluation
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-1812

Robert Thomas
Chairman, Board of Trustees
University of Tampa
4333 South 50th Street
P.O. Box E
Tampa, Florida 33675
813/284-3181

Katie D. Tucker
Budget Analyst
DOA - Division of Budget
530 Carlton Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-8547

Ralph D. Turlington
Commissioner of Education
The Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/487-1785

Thomas J. Turner
Vice President and Dean of the University
Stetson University
Woodland Boulevard
DeLand, Florida 32720
904/734-4121 ext. 596

Ilona Turrisi
Budget Director
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
904/644-4203

Lawrence Worley Tyree
President
Gulf Coast Community College
5230 West Highway 98
Panama City, Florida 32401
904/769-1551 ext. 260

George J. Wanko
Dean of Student Affairs
Barry College
11300 N.E. Second Avenue
Miami, Florida 33161
305/758-3392 ext. 232

Earl S. Weldon
President
Seminole Community College
Sanford, Florida 32771
904/323-1450 ext. 275

Mark K. Wheeler
President
Florida Association of Private Schools
3000 E. Las Olas Blvd.
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33316
305/463-3000

Robert W. White
Executive Director
Florida Student Association
226 West Pensacola Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
904/222-3697

James Wilkerson
Florida Vocational Advisory Council
Department of Education
Knott Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Paul P. Williams
President
Lake-Sumter Community College
59000 U.S. 441, South
Leesburg, Florida 32748
904/787-3747

Grayce Williamson
500 Ninth Avenue North
Jacksonville Beach, Florida 32250
904/246-7466

Aubrey Willis
Director
Aubrey Willis School of Piano Tuning and Repairing
5840 W. Concord Avenue
P.O. Drawer 15190
Orlando, Florida 32808
305/299-3690

Rod Willis
Senior Budget Analyst
DOA - Division of Budget
530 Carlton Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-8443

Clyde J. Wingfield
Executive Vice President for
Academic Affairs and Provost
University of Miami
240 Ashe Building
Coral Gables, Florida 33124
305/284-3356

Lawrence R. Wood
Director and Owner
Empire School of Piano Tuning
1753 S.W. 23 Terrace
Miami, Florida 33145
305/856-3253

Benjamin R. Wygal
President
Florida Junior College at
Jacksonville
21 W. Church Street
Jacksonville, Florida 32202
904/358-1812

Alton W. Yates
Administrative Assistant to
the Mayor
City of Jacksonville
1400 City Hall
Jacksonville, Florida 32202